THE FUND FOR PEACE

Realizing "Never Again"

Regional Capacities to Protect Civilians in Violent Conflicts

Patricia Taft

with **Jason Ladnier**

January 2006

The mission of The Fund for Peace is to prevent war and alleviate the conditions that cause war. The Fund promotes education and research for practical solutions. It is a consistent advocate of promoting social justice and respect for the principles of constitutional democracy.

Realizing “Never Again”: Regional Capacities to Protect Civilians in Violent Conflicts

The Fund for Peace
1701 K Street, NW - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 223-7940
www.fundforpeace.org

Cover Picture: This picture was taken in Monrovia, Liberia in October of 2003. It depicts a monument commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Geneva conventions with the caption, "Even Wars Have Limits." The photo was taken just months after the end of the country's second brutal civil war in ten years. Both the monument and surrounding buildings are riddled with bullet holes. Photo credit: Jason Ladnier

Foreword

Darfur, Sudan, is the latest example of how the international community is failing to address humanitarian crises adequately. Local militias are not only continuing their direct attacks on civilians, but they are also destroying infrastructure that had been constructed by humanitarian workers to provide water and other services to the local population. Experts estimate that the war in Darfur has led to about 200,000 deaths and created more than two million refugees and displaced persons. The Sudanese government has cut off supplies of jet fuel for aid organizations, which need to fly in supplies because of dangers on the ground. Furthermore, the government is continuing to provide assistance to the local militias and, instead of feeding its citizens, it is paying over half a million dollars to an American lobbyist to get the United States and the international community off its back.

In Rwanda, the international community failed to respond. The crisis in Sudan, by contrast, has generated some positive, albeit limited, responses. However, African Union troops, most of whom are funded by European and North American partners, lack sufficient manpower, money and authority to be effective. Though increases are planned, there are only an estimated 7,000 troops assigned to monitor an area the size of France, and their rules of engagement remain constrained. Additionally, their resources are sometimes fatally limited -- two Nigerian soldiers were killed in a firefight in September because they ran out of ammunition. To quote an African Union soldier currently in Darfur: "We are like sitting ducks." On-and-off talks have been taking place for a year and a half, with no results.

Since the end of World War II, much progress had been made in preventing and responding to conflicts. Yet, the world either will not or cannot mount robust military interventions to protect civilians in complex humanitarian emergencies that threaten widespread death and devastation. "Never again," the slogan that was supposed to represent the world's commitment to ending genocide, has not been realized. Bolder actions need to be taken to create a new international architecture of response, giving teeth to the emerging United Nations norm of the "responsibility to protect."

Even as most nations agree that actions must be taken to stop genocide and ethnic cleansing, humanitarian intervention as a concept remains controversial, in part because of the debate over terrorism and the invasion of Iraq, which have complicated the debate. Many nations are suspicious that humanitarian intervention is merely a rationalization for strategic intervention. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the international community is moving inexorably toward a new set of norms.

The African Union is the first multinational organization that has incorporated into its charter the collective right to intervene in conflicts to protect civilians caught up in humanitarian emergencies. Subregional organizations in Africa, such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), have acted on this principle. There is mounting pressure for NATO to take on large-scale humanitarian missions around the

world. However, NATO's current commitments in the Balkans and its growing role in Afghanistan - in addition to calls by certain members for the organization to avoid a significant role in Africa - will likely prevent it from increasing its presence in humanitarian interventions elsewhere. The U.S. Department of Defense issued a directive to its military to prepare more thoroughly for post-conflict stability operations. Other regions, such as South America and Southeast Asia, though more conservative in their approaches, are inching their way towards more collective action.

Clearly, there is growing activity in the area of regional responses to internal war. The FfP anticipated this trend and created a program dedicated to examining this issue five years ago. This report is the third in a trilogy summarizing our findings. Our first report, *Neighbors on Alert: Regional Views on Humanitarian Intervention,* laid out the consensus norms developed by a range of diverse participants in FfP conferences focused on four regions: Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe. The second report, *Building the Capacity to Protect: The Role of Civil Society,* detailed the views of civil society in those four regions. This report, *Realizing "Never Again": Regional Capacities to Protect Civilians in Violent Conflicts in Africa, the Americas, Asia and Europe,* summarizes regional capacities to put boots on the ground. These documents, and others relating to this project can be obtained at the Fund for Peace website: www.fundforpeace.org.

Cumulatively, this substantial body of work - based on several conferences, regional workshops and hundreds of field interviews - represents the most comprehensive in-depth survey of the issue thus far. We hope that it will spur further research and, most importantly, concrete action to strengthen the will and ability of the international community to save lives.

The most important recommendation in this report is that the international community should begin to think about a two-phased approach to humanitarian response, based on strengthening the niche capacities of regional actors as first responders with rapid reaction forces and a robust mandate. Those capacities could then be strengthened by more sustained operations.

For next steps, the Fund for Peace plans to take this project to the Middle East to probe ways in which that region can protect civilians caught in conflict. We also would like to see a "Regions of the World Summit" held to engage the global leadership of regional organizations as a group. In that context, they could exchange views, compare respective experiences, and share best practices to gain a new appreciation of the critical role of regional actors, giving them a greater sense of how they can promote peace.

Pauline H. Baker
President

Realizing "Never Again"

Regional Capacities to Protect Civilians in Violent Conflicts

Contents

Acknowledgements

It would be impossible to list the names of all of the individuals that contributed to this research undertaking. On four continents, in more than thirty countries, we met with hundreds of military, political and civil society leaders who gave graciously of their time and wisdom. We also received open doors at each of the regional and subregional organizations we visited, as well as at regional peacekeeping training facilities. Senior representatives of the United Nations, NATO, and the European Union were fundamental in facilitating our trips to active peacekeeping operations in Africa and Europe, while retired representatives of various multinational bodies gave us detailed accounts of past operations. It is the considerable wisdom of these many individuals contained within this text, and for this we express our utmost thanks and gratitude.

The Fund for Peace would also like to thank the U.S.-based organizations and universities that helped us identify key people in each country to interview and often times assisted us in arranging the meetings. These include: The United States Institute of Peace (USIP), the Henry L. Stimson Center, The Atlantic Council of the United States, the Council on Foreign Relations, The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Refugees International, The Public International Law and Policy Group (PILPG), National Defense University, American University, Georgetown University, and the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. We would further like to thank the Embassies of Argentina, Italy, Hungary, Romania, Singapore, Japan, Thailand, France, Brazil, the UK and the European Council delegation to the U.S. for going beyond the line of duty in facilitating our interviews and visits.

None of this research would have been possible without the funding received from the Governments of the Netherlands and Canada, and from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Fund for Peace also wishes to thank its advisory group that has continually provided direction and advice throughout the entire five years of the program. We would also like to thank our esteemed Board members for their contributions and insights over the years.

The authors would like to express their gratitude to several staff members at the Fund for Peace who were instrumental in the completion of this report, in particular, the imparted wisdom, careful editing, and encouragement given by Pauline H. Baker. We would also like to thank Isaac Borocz for his patience and fine editing. Thank you to Colonel (ret) Mark Kalber who offered insight and advice from an American military perspective. Finally, we owe a very special thanks to Krista Hendry who gave generously of her time and expertise, especially in organizing thoughts and creating the graphics and design for the final product.

We also wish to thank the talented interns who contributed research to the project: Dara Francis, Matthew Greenberg, Kent DePinto, Meghan Grimes, Marko Frigelj, Antonio Perez-Hernandez and Mark Loucas.

Executive Summary

As the conflicts of the past two decades have demonstrated, the days of traditional peacekeeping operations are over. Recent wars, most of which have been internal conflicts in weak and failing states, have become increasingly violent and have claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians across the globe. While there have been some effective peace enforcement missions of note, the United Nations has often found itself under-prepared and out-maneuvered, operating from a reactionary position rather than an anticipatory one. As the Rwanda genocide demonstrated, political constraints at the Security Council, the slow generation of resources, and inadequate mandates have all contributed the UN's inability to act quickly and effectively when confronted with a humanitarian crisis. While most agree that the UN should maintain the ultimate authority in sanctioning an outside military intervention to stop bloodshed, coalitions of member states and regional and subregional organizations have a greater role to play in supporting the UN in this regard. Many are assuming responsibility, but there are significant gaps in capacities and norms around the world.

The Fund for Peace believes that the international community should now focus on a "second generation" of peacekeepers or peace enforcers that are needed to address the main threats to global security today. There remains a gap between the recognition of needs and the identification of capacities. While there have been efforts to evaluate lessons learned from previous and ongoing missions, it does not always translate into institutional learning at the subregional and regional levels. Recent operations have demonstrated that the experiences and niche capacities that nations and regional organizations bring to peacekeeping and stability operations have frequently proven critical to the success of the mission. This report reviews those capacities, identifying both the strengths and weaknesses of a vital part of the evolving international architecture of peace and stability operations in the 21st century.

Many countries have long and proud histories of participating in UN peacekeeping operations and bring invaluable experience to the table. Traditional troop contributors such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Jordan, Argentina, Canada, Uruguay, and Kenya have critical skills gathered from participation in numerous operations over the years. Other, newer, participants, acting as part of coalitions, have also demonstrated surprising capacities crucial to a new generation of peacekeeping and stability operations. For example, Thailand and Japan have exhibited a high level of adeptness in search and rescue missions. Singapore and Chile possess the air and naval capacities to deploy rapidly to an outside theater of operations, while Hungary has pre-identified, emergency bio-medical units. Italy and France, as well as Senegal, Romania, and Chile all possess gendarmerie capacities, which have proven highly valuable in a wide range of peacekeeping operations. Ukraine, in addition to having strategic airlift abilities, also has troops that have been praised for their riot and crowd control skills.

In examining regional and subregional organizations, the African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the European Union (EU),

and NATO have been the most forward-looking globally in assuming responsibility for human security. Other subregional bodies, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), have started debating whether the organization has a role to play in intervening in a member state that has an ongoing humanitarian emergency, if the state will not of cannot protect civilians at risk. For the Organization of American States (OAS) and other Latin American regional alliances, while there have been preventive diplomatic interventions, adopting more coercive measures or identifying specific capacities for undertaking a military intervention after a conflict has erupted is unlikely to be considered. In both Asia and Latin America, it is more likely that coalitions of willing states, rather than subregional organizations, will continue to be the military "first responders," possibly with a follow-on UN mission.

The global war on terrorism (GWOT) has also, at times, complicated efforts to harmonize and rationalize action for human security. In particular, the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in March 2003 was characterized as a humanitarian intervention after, not before, the invasion. Due to the highly polarizing debates surrounding the event, some nations have refused to even consider using military force within the borders of a sovereign country, even when genocide may be occurring. Moreover, the extreme violence that has resulted in the aftermath of the overthrow of the Saddam Hussein regime calls into question what a peacekeeping or stability operation entails versus confronting an all-out insurgency. At the political level, tensions between the U.S. and nations opposed to the Iraq war have translated into a reluctance to work together to develop better strategies to confront genuine humanitarian emergencies.

Despite the political schisms that the Iraq campaign has created, the fight against terrorism has also led to improved cooperation that may prove beneficial for future peacekeeping and stability operations. In Southeast Asia, U.S. Pacific Command (US PACOM) has increased and expanded naval exercises with several nations that routinely incorporate building rapid-reaction capacities for humanitarian emergencies. Similarly, Eastern and Central European countries have increased military-to-military training exercises and exchanges. These are designed to increase interoperability, identify best practices, and harmonize standards and equipment. Peace and stability operations have also played a role in increasing donor-nation interoperability, with greater cooperation and harmonization between Australia and Southeast Asian nations following the East Timor intervention. Additionally, NATO, through its Partnership for Peace (PfP) program, has led the way in standardizing and harmonizing training and military equipment in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus that has contributed to better interoperability between these countries in general.

Training for peacekeeping and stability operations is critical to successful missions. This should be improved on several levels. While the U.S., UK, France, and other Western nations all provide training assistance and equipment to Africa through various programs, coordination among donor countries is often problematic. Beyond language disparities, training programs and equipment can vary widely leading to a lack of interoperability on the ground. A better coordination strategy between donor nations would eliminate many

of these issues. Additionally, particularly in Africa, troops trained for peacekeeping by foreign nations are often kept at home to deal with internal security matters and not sent to peacekeeping missions. While it would be nearly impossible to track all individuals trained, there needs to be a better method for ensuring that troops trained for peacekeeping are available specifically for that purpose.

Military exchange programs between the U.S. and Western Europe and nations in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe are fundamental in building skills and improving performance in operations. The U.S. and Western Europe should significantly expand the existing opportunities for mid-level military personnel from around the world to participate in courses at training schools abroad. Former military commanders in peacekeeping operations have repeatedly cited the training they received abroad as essential in building skills they were able to employ in a mission. Most importantly, these skills can be transferred to younger officers once students return to their home countries.

Additionally, other military-to-military activities have been important in building capacities for peace and stability operations. The U.S. National Guard, through its military-to-military program, was able to demonstrate how it undertook peacekeeping in Bosnia to several top Mongolian officers. Other initiatives undertaken by the U.S. and Western governments have sought to build institutional capacity within national militaries. What continues to be problematic, particularly in the U.S., is the appropriation of funds for non-training related military-to-military programs. More flexibility is needed in funding military initiatives that seek to build capacity outside of actual field training, from developing doctrine to building support functions, civil-military capabilities, and human rights protection.

Regional peacekeeping training schools are another important factor in ensuring that military and police sent to peacekeeping operations abroad have the proper level of preparation. Training centers exist throughout Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Europe. Several centers, such as the one in Chile, are highly advanced and provide a wide range of courses for students, including language and human rights training. Others suffer from a lack of funding and are in need of both outside financial and staff assistance. Peacekeeping training schools foster a sense of regional identity among various national militaries and police and can be a valuable location for cataloguing lessons learned from previous operations. The presence of trainers from around the world also allows for best practices to be shared across continents. Thus, donor nations should continue to provide personnel to these centers and expand their assistance programs. However, ad-hoc contributions of personnel and equipment have limited the abilities of some centers to plan for training courses. There needs to be greater coordination among the U.S., UK, France, Germany, and Japan, the major providers.

The utility of stability police in peacekeeping operations has become increasingly apparent over the past ten years. Stability police, or gendarmerie forces, are trained to execute a wide variety of tasks that fall between traditional war fighting and civilian policing. These tasks include crowd control, intelligence gathering, surveillance, border

patrol, and arrest and interdiction. Stability police can be deployed as units and bring lethal force to bear in a peacekeeping mission. They can also perform the functions of civilian police and address the post-conflict security gap that exists in many peacekeeping operations. Stability police have proven critical in restoring law and order in peacekeeping missions, particularly in the Balkans. In many missions, multinational forces have been withdrawn too early without sufficient stability measures in place to ensure a peaceful transition. This is one of the most consistent shortcomings of peacekeeping operations.

At the 2004 G-8 Summit in Sea Island Georgia, Italy took the lead in creating the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU). CoESPU is tasked with developing doctrine and common operational procedures for stability police in peacekeeping. The U.S. has been strongly supportive of CoESPU. All members of the G-8 should continue its efforts to build this capacity for global peacekeeping, as gendarmerie forces are increasingly coming to typify a "second generation" of peacekeepers. More effort should be made to learn from the experiences of stability police in peacekeeping. National gendarmerie forces exist throughout the world and, until recently, they have not been well understood by countries that do not possess this capacity. However, from Kosovo to Haiti, the utility of stability police in peacekeeping is evident. More resources should be dedicated to increasing this capacity, particularly at the national level. Argentina, for example, a country whose gendarmerie forces have a well-deserved and highly praised reputation for professionalism, is struggling to obtain sufficient resources for its gendarmerie training center. Many countries are also choosing to keep these forces at home rather than deploy them to peacekeeping operations. While CoESPU is a good start, the international community should offer more incentives to increase this valuable capacity for peacekeeping, particularly to provide direct support for international gendarmerie training centers.

In any peacekeeping operation, the relationship between the civilian and military components of the mission is vital. However, in most missions, civilian agencies and military peacekeepers are frequently viewed as being at odds. Keeping the peace and rebuilding a viable state after conflict need to go hand-in-hand but rarely do. All too often, once the active fighting has stopped, peacekeepers maintain a truce, often at the cost of dividing the people within a state. Civilian agencies, on the other hand, work to reintegrate warring parties and build representative institutions. While the goal of the military and civilian sides of a mission are the same, to stabilize and rebuild a country to the point where it no longer needs outside assistance, they are often perceived, or perceive each other, as having different agendas.

An attempt to address this disparity was introduced in Afghanistan in 2003, with the creation of the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) model. The PRTs are an attempt to co-locate a small international military and civilian component, with representation from the Afghan Ministry of the Interior, at the local level throughout the country, with the goal of increasing the legitimacy of the national government. As more PRTs transition from Coalition leadership to NATO ISAF command, variations are emerging based on

how national actors approach civil-military cooperation (CIMIC). Each ISAF PRT is under the command of a NATO member country. While it is still early in the evaluation process, some nations appear to have realized more successes in fulfilling their mandates than others. While the security situation on the ground remains a key factor, an evaluation of different national models of CIMIC in peacekeeping operations would create a database of best practices in a wide variety of security environments. These best practices could then help shape future PRT-like initiatives, which are now being planned for Iraq, and could offer promise in other operations.

The willingness of regional and subregional organizations to take a more proactive role in protecting human security has often been complicated by a failure of these organizations to create clear lines of communication among themselves. In Africa, both ECOWAS and the African Union have taken action to stop unfolding tragedies on the continent but there are no clearly established lines of communication between them. This can lead to duplication of efforts or, more likely, a failure to address critical needs, with specific tasks falling through the cracks. There also needs to be a more clear understanding of priorities and procedures when troops, pre-identified for use by both a subregional and regional body, are simultaneously needed in two places at once. Without a well-defined understanding of which organization or crisis area has primacy in these situations, problems with force projection and force generation will continue to be a major hurdle.

While arrangements between NATO and the EU regarding communication are more comprehensive, issues of force projection and generation are a problem in Europe. Capacities designated for NATO use are also, in certain circumstances, counted as EU rapid reaction resources. Double-counting hinders planning at the strategic level. Additionally, throughout regional and subregional organizations, the imposition of national caveats continue to impede planning for peacekeeping operations at the strategic level and the execution of tasks once in-theater. While certain member nations are flexible in allowing their personnel to perform a wide variety of tasks, others are more rigid, even when the task appears to fall within the area of responsibility of that nation's military or police. For example, several nations with gendarmeries will not allow their forces to fall under a military chain-of-command in a hostile environment, despite the fact that they are noted for their abilities to perform critical tasks specifically in these situations. Caveats can also change from mission-to-mission, further complicating planning. A clear and more consistent application of caveats by member states would greatly improve the abilities of regional and subregional bodies to plan for future interventions.

Finally, this study only covers select countries and organizations in four regions. Further and ongoing research into the capacities available to protect civilians is needed. Continuing assessments of successful practices from past and ongoing peacekeeping operations are needed to develop a deeper understanding of the role of regional actors in protecting civilians caught in conflict. This would facilitate greater information sharing at the state, subregional and regional levels. Better coordination, communication and use of resources are fundamental in addressing the humanitarian emergencies confronting the

international community. As the slow or inadequate responses to the internal wars in Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, and Darfur have demonstrated, it will take a global effort to ensure that next time we can truly realize "never again," the expression that was meant to prevent mass killings after the carnage of World War II. Clearly, the international community still has a long way to go in fulfilling that goal. Shoring up the capacities of regional organizations is one way to reach it in the future.

Recommendations

To the international community

- Undertake further work to identify the gaps between needs and capacities, understanding that niche capacities can prove critical to success of missions.
- Continue with efforts to standardize and harmonize training and military equipment in order to improve interoperability among troop-contributing countries.
- Create a coordination strategy between donor nations to address issues of interoperability on the ground caused by wide variations in training programs and equipment.
- Develop a method to ensure that troops trained for peacekeeping are available for that purpose and do not become combatants in their own countries' civil wars.
- Build fundamental skills and improve performance in operations through military exchange programs by expanding the opportunities for mid-level military personnel from around the world to participate in courses at regional training schools.
- Provide qualified personnel to existing regional training centers and expand assistance programs.
- Increase the availability of stability police, develop a common doctrine and operational procedures, and provide assistance, training, and equipment for expanded global gendarmerie capacities.
- Increase bilateral and multilateral training exercises to build capacity for rapid response in humanitarian emergencies.
- Identify and share best national models of civil-military cooperation, including analyzing the Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) model in Afghanistan for future peacekeeping and stability operations.
- Create well-defined and transparent guidelines regarding which organization has primacy in cases in which troops and military assets have been pre-identified by two or more organizations.
- Develop a clearer and more consistent application of caveats for forces in peacekeeping missions.
- Develop a deeper understanding of best practices and capabilities by sponsoring more research and increased information sharing.

To the regional and subregional organizations

- Take a more active role globally in assuming responsibility for humanitarian protection in own areas or regions.
- Adopt more coercive measures regarding the violation of human security and identify specific capacities for undertaking military interventions for that purpose.
- Develop the capacity to attract increased funding and training assistance from the donor community for regional peacekeeping training schools by showing concrete benefits and results.
- Create organizational capacity to work with Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units (CoESPU), ensuring that the experiences of national gendarmes operating as

part of a regional or subregional organization's peacekeeping force are communicated.
- Institute a process to streamline communications between regional and sub-regional organizations.
- Define which niche capacities are of greatest value, regionally, and work with member states to institute these as a dedicated and rapidly deployable capability.
- Develop a list of assessments of niche capacities by country to aid in planning for a military intervention.
- Develop common doctrine that incorporates existing niche capacities.
- Work with member states to diversify which niche capacities they intend to dedicate to peace and stability operations.

To the United States
- Take the lead in developing closer working relations with other states and the UN to develop better strategies to confront humanitarian emergencies, beyond ad hoc responses as crises arise.
- Continue supporting the expansion of joint exercises with other nations that incorporate building rapid reaction capacities for humanitarian emergencies.
- Increase support and flexibility in funding for military-to-military activities that seek to build peacekeeping capacity beyond field training to include the entire range of functions needed in peace and stability operations.
- Support the norm of the Responsibility to Protect at the UN and the newly proposed UN Peacebuilding Commission recommended by High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. This will not only enhance UN capabilities, but reinforce regional capacities as well.
- Support the diplomatic and peacekeeping capabilities of regional organizations that are willing to assume a greater role in preventing conflict and protecting civilians caught in conflict.
- Assist smaller states in further developing niche capacities to allow them to play a greater role in international security.
- Improve interagency coordination among the various military and training assistance programs to eliminate duplications and identify gaps.

Introduction

The international community today finds itself facing a new confluence of threats to global security. In the years following the end of the Cold War, threats to security emanating from traditional interstate warfare have lessened while the predominance of intrastate conflicts pose the main challenge to peace and stability. The dissolution of states into ethnic and tribal warfare has caused widespread loss and human suffering and has also threatened entire regions with chaos and collapse. Additionally, the threats posed by weak and failed states, like Somalia and Afghanistan, have illustrated that ambivalence can no longer be an international policy option when it comes to confronting state collapse. These emerging challenges to security have necessitated the development of a new international architecture of response. This new architecture must incorporate both national and regional solutions.

The 1990s opened with three very deadly intrastate conflicts in two separate regions of the world. In Somalia, years of civil war resulted in a widespread famine that necessitated a quick UN intervention. However, unlike the conflicts of the past four decades in which the UN had intervened to enforce a ceasefire while addressing the humanitarian aspects of a post-conflict mission, there was no peace to uphold. Overburdened and under fire, an international military intervention was then spearheaded by the United States to help the beleaguered UN. Two years later, after sustaining casualties and failing to restore security to the country, the U.S. withdrew. Shortly thereafter, the UN followed. Today, over a decade later, Somalia remains a failed state.

In the tiny African country of Rwanda, a horror story was unfolding that would come to mark the UN's biggest failing ever. In the face of an impending genocide, the already inadequate mission was withdrawn and the world stood by as almost one million lives were lost. At the UN Security Council, national interests took precedent over human lives which resulted in one of the largest slaughters of the twentieth century. With the exception of the brave Canadian general, Romeo Dallaire, and a small contingent of dedicated soldiers, mostly from Africa, Rwanda was allowed to burn.

Meanwhile, in Southeastern Europe, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was beginning to unravel. The European community, not having had to confront a wide-scale humanitarian disaster on the continent since World War II, was paralyzed. As European leaders and the UN struggled to find a negotiated end to the bloodshed in Croatia and Bosnia, hundreds of thousands of lives were lost. Another feeble UN mission with an inadequate mandate resulted in the inability of the organization to do anything to prevent the genocide that was unfolding. The U.S., still stinging from its defeat in Somalia, was unwilling to intervene. Four years after the war began and under intense public pressure to stop the bloodshed, the NATO finally undertook a military campaign to end the war. It was the first time the trans-Atlantic military alliance was used to intervene to stop an intrastate warfare.

Around the same time in West Africa, ECOWAS was undertaking its own military intervention to stop the civil war in Liberia. Spearheaded by Nigeria, the Liberian

intervention signaled the first time an African subregional organization was willing to move beyond its original inception as an economic community and embrace the role of a military enforcer of security. In the years that followed, NATO and ECOWAS remained the two main regional and subregional bodies willing to act to stop humanitarian crises when the UN failed or was unable to do so. However, in both cases, questions surrounding the legality of the missions, the accountability of the organizations, and the utility of granting bodies other than the UN with the normative right to intervene to stop humanitarian disasters began to emerge. It is a debate that continues today.

Over the next decade, the international community faced another emerging trend. In Haiti, Sierra Leone, Albania, Cote d'Ivoire, East Timor, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), coalitions of willing states began to intervene in intrastate wars in their neighborhoods or in former colonies. The British-led intervention in Sierra Leone was critical in stopping the civil war, while the French have intervened or taken the lead in interventions in Cote d'Ivoire and the DRC. In both Haiti interventions, the U.S. and France spearheaded the initial interventions while the UN prepared for a follow-on mission. Similarly, the Italians led an intervention in Albania when the country was threatened with collapse. In Indonesia, the Australian-led intervention was crucial in stopping the violence in East Timor. While each of these interventions was later followed-up by a UN or EU peacekeeping mission, the use of coalitions of willing state actors as "first responders" started to be examined as an alternative to waiting for a Security Council-mandated UN intervention.

As devastating intrastate conflicts erupted throughout Africa, Europe, and Southeast Asia, it became clear that new solutions were needed to address the complex problems emanating from intrastate warfare and the threats posed by weak and failed states. While it was largely agreed that inaction in the face of humanitarian emergencies was unacceptable, the question of which organization, or coalitions of willing states, had the ultimate authority to take action became paramount. A lack of political will continued to prove the main stumbling block to action while practical realities concerning the generation of resources to respond hindered effectiveness, even once a political consensus had been reached.

While the UN has proved adept at confronting the main tasks of rebuilding states after war, it lacks the resources to effectively mount a military intervention to stop humanitarian crises occurring around the globe. Increasingly, calls for interventions have been answered by regional and subregional bodies, like the AU, NATO and ECOWAS, and coalitions of willing state actors, such as the Australian-led coalition in East Timor. The use of regional and subregional bodies in humanitarian interventions is, in itself, problematic. Beyond the issues surrounding the legitimacy of actors other than the UN to undertake military interventions into sovereign states, problems have arisen based on historical and cultural precedents in various regions.

Additionally, although a regional or subregional body may be willing to accept responsibility for enforcing security among its member states, the acceptance of responsibility has not always translated into actual capacity. Particularly in the case of

Africa, a willingness to take on more responsibility for continental security has been plagued by a chronic shortage of resources and training. In Europe, continental capacities are stretched and political infighting among the members of the main regional bodies, NATO, the EU, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), have constrained the actions of each organization. In East Asia and Latin America, there exists opposition to allowing the main political bodies in each region, the Association of Southeast Asian States (ASEAN) and the Organization of American States (OAS), to assume an enforcement role in regional security. Despite a willingness on the part of some member states to embrace a more robust role for each organization, the history of outside interventions in both regions has resulted in a strong unwillingness to move either body beyond traditional political dispute resolution mechanisms, even in times of crises.

In the face of the debates between the various regional and subregional bodies and their member states and the continued strain on UN resources to provide robust peacekeeping and stabilization capacities, a critical evaluation of resources is necessary. Beneath the political willingness of certain regional and subregional bodies, as well as their member states, to undertake a more robust role in international security lies the question of their actual capacities to do so. As evidenced by the current AU mission in Darfur, the political willingness of the AU to embrace a role as the enforcer of security in Africa has not necessarily resulted in the ability of the organization to save lives. While the mission is an ambitious one, it is inadequate to confront the scale of atrocities occurring in Western Sudan. Critical capacities such as airlift and logistical equipment need to be supplied by outside nations while the inability of member states to generate an adequate number of troops has left the mission woefully under-supported, as of this writing.

Given the inability of regional and subregional bodies outside of Europe to plan, execute and sustain a peacekeeping mission without external assistance, a new approach must be explored. Traditional UN VI peacekeeping operations are likely a thing of the past. Today's conflicts are increasingly deadly and necessitate flexible and rapidly deployable forces that have the authority and the will to act to stop violence. These forces need to be able to execute a wide range of tasks, including filling the "security gap" that often exists between the military intervention side of a mission and the civilian-led post-conflict and reconstruction stages. The skills and material resources that exist at the national level must therefore be explored in greater detail to identify what niche capacities exist globally. A cataloguing of these capacities, region-by-region, will be of short- and long-term benefit to international bodies like the UN, as well as to regional and subregional bodies, in the early identification and planning for the use of resources.

What follows is a detailed analysis of the capacities of regional and subregional bodies in Africa, Latin America, East Asia, and Europe to respond to complex humanitarian emergencies. This report surveys existing capabilities, identifies gaps, and calls for a coordinated strategy for strengthening and harmonizing regional capacities, both within regions and among them.

AFRICA

Review of Selected Organizations

Organizations
- The African Union (AU)
- The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
- The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)
- The Southern African Development Community (SADC)

Continentally, Africa, along with Europe, remains the most forward thinking of the four regions compared concerning developing military and political capacities to intervene in a humanitarian crisis. What is lacking across the African continent as a whole, however, are the necessary resources, structurally, institutionally, and militarily, to mount a swift and comprehensive intervention without the aid of extra-continental actors. Of the continent's four main regional and subregional bodies, the African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) have actively undertaken military interventions while the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) has functioned primarily as a dispute interlocutor and the main facilitator of the Sudanese and Somali peace negotiations. In each subregion, and within the regional body of the AU, certain member states have played a dominant role in each intervention and negotiation process, at times bringing both the necessary political and financial weight along with more developed military capabilities. In West and Southern Africa, Nigeria and South Africa have played the lead roles, including contributing the main support to the African Union. In East Africa, Kenya has taken the lead within IGAD in both the Sudan and Somalia peace processes. In order for Africa to build an effective security framework on the continent, however, the subregional organizations and the African Union must clarify their relationship with each other and identify the functions and roles of each body. In addition, the United Nations, while supportive of the regional and subregional organizations, has yet to implement a formal mechanism for coordinating with these actors. It is crucial for the United Nations and the African Union, in particular, to clarify the expectations that each has of the other.

The African Union

The African Union, the continent's main political body, has taken unprecedented steps towards transforming itself from an organization overseeing the transition from colonialism to independence to one that serves as a guarantor of African security. Formerly the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the AU first embraced the creation of a security-based decision-making organ, the Peace and Security Council (PSC), in 2002 at the first ordinary session of the AU Assembly in South Africa. The PSC is comprised of four main components, including a Panel of the Wise, a continental Early Warning System, the African Standby Force (ASF), and the Peace Fund, for the provision of financial resources. The protocol establishing the PSC came into force in December

2003 and signified the first time any regional organization had formally ratified the normative right to intervene in the internal affairs of member states when the UN is unable or unwilling to act to protect civilians. This was a milestone not only for Africa, but also for regional bodies as a whole.

The establishment of the ASF calls for each of Africa's five regions; south, east, west, north and central, to provide a rapidly deployable brigade for a wide range of peace support operations. While the AU set out the initial force requirements and generic standard operating procedures (SOPs) for the ASF, each region is expected to work with member states to develop SOPs and identify resources for the regional brigade. The harmonization of the brigades is supposed to be coordinated by the PSC along with regional Heads of State, Ministries of Defense and Security, and Chiefs of Defense Staff. In certain regions, East and Southern Africa in particular, the regional economic communities of IGAD and SADC have agreed to serve as the interim or permanent coordination centers of the brigades. Additionally, peace support training centers in West, East and Southern Africa are envisaged to play a key role in coordinating training and establishing mechanisms for interoperability.[1]

The AU envisions having all ASF brigades fully operational by June 2010 and able to be deployed under the authority of a UN Security Council Resolution or an African Union mandate. AU military planners hope that the ASF will primarily be used as a UN-mandated monitoring and support force in order to offset the financial strains of deploying it as an AU-financed military capacity. If the ASF is deployed as part of a UN mission, all costs will be incurred by the UN. Additionally, salaries for troops are considerably higher when deployed as part of the UN rather than as an AU force. Currently, Southern Africa has progressed the most rapidly in meeting the June 30, 2005 deadline for the first phase of preparations. According to reports, member countries have pledged over 6,000 troops, and a logistical support system has been approved. As is described in more detail later, the comparatively advanced capacities of South Africa have facilitated most of the progress of SADC overall, and this is likely also a key factor in the establishment of the SADC brigade.[2]

The AU deployed its first peacekeeping mission to Burundi in April 2003 ahead of the later-mandated UN Mission in Burundi (ONUB). At its full deployment, the African Union Mission in Burundi (AMIB) consisted of approximately 3,400 troops, primarily from South Africa, Ethiopia and Mozambique. Initially, AMIB was established as a monitoring mission and not given rules of engagement (ROEs) for civilian protection. According to AU officials, once deployed on the ground, AMIB found itself in an active conflict where neither party had yet accepted a ceasefire agreement. Moreover, AMIB was tasked with separating, quartering and cantoning over 60,000 combatants. When it became apparent that a more robust mandate would be required, senior AU military officials scrambled to find appropriate guidelines. According to one AU staff planner, "I

[1] FfP interviews, AU headquarters, Addis Ababa, November 2003.
[2] Southscan Report on SADC brigade, available online: http://allafrica.com/stories/200509300198.html

was looking at the [UN] ROEs from Bosnia, Mozambique and Croatia trying to cobble together the most appropriate one for AMIB."[3]

South Africa bore the greatest cost for AMIB, contributed the lion's share of equipment and supplies, and committed the troops and logistical support. Funding for the AMIB mission was slowed by both normal UN and donor country delays as well as a lack of capacity at AU headquarters. Insufficient staff and weak financial structures for processing large amounts of donor funding was repeatedly cited as areas that needed critical improvement if the AU were to undertake peacekeeping and support operations.[4] The deployment of the mission at a time when the PSC was just being formed also exposed shortcomings such as the inability to create adequate ROEs and monitor deployment and sustainability. Although South African capacities in planning, deployment and sustainability proved critical, AMIB was unable to carry out its mandate outside of the main urban centers. However, the transfer to the UN follow-on mission, which deployed 14 months later, was reported to be relatively seamless. Close cooperation between the AU and UN, based on the early knowledge that the AU would only be deploying in support of a future UN mission, is likely the reason for the smooth transition.[5]

The second AU endeavor at peacekeeping occurred in the Western Sudan region of Darfur. The full scale of the human tragedy unfolding in Darfur began surfacing in the media in early 2004 with reports of systematic rapes, beatings, and murders of civilians by the rebel militia Janjaweed. As the situation started rapidly deteriorating, the AU dispatched an assessment mission to Darfur in May 2004 to asses the security situation. The recommendations from the mission led to the establishment of a ceasefire commission and the deployment of unarmed observers. When it became clear that the security situation on the ground was dire, the AU authorized the deployment of two composite companies, one from Rwanda and one from Nigeria, to protect the observer mission. Despite the AU presence, attacks on civilians continued with staggering casualties and internally displaced persons (IDPs) rates reported almost daily.[6]

In October 2004, the AU PSC, under pressure from member states and the international community, revised the original AU Mission in Sudan (AMIS) mandate to allow for the limited protection of civilians under the imminent threat of attack. It also authorized the deployment of a 3,320-strong force that included military personnel, observers, civilian police and civilian staff. Despite strengthening the new AU mission (AMIS II) and mandate, the number of troops was woefully inadequate to deal with the crisis. In a region roughly the size of France, the small AU force was only able to make a limited impact, operating effectively as an enhanced observer mission. Although an AU Joint Assessment Mission (JAM), undertaken with the U.S., EU and UN in April 2005, found

[3] FfP interviews, AU headquarters, Addis Ababa, November 2003.
[4] Ibid.
[5] "Opportunities and Challenges for Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect the AU's Emerging Peace and Security Regime" Prepared by Kristiana Powell, the North-South Institute, Ottawa, Canada Institute for Security Studies (ISS) Monograph No 119 (May 2005).
[6] International Crisis Group (ICG) Reports on Darfur, nos. 76, 80, 89. Available online at: http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=1230&l=1

that the AU forces made a positive difference in the security situation in some areas and stopped the violence in the region as a whole, the mission was still highly inadequate to confront the situation on the ground.[7] Following the release of the report, the PSC then authorized a near doubling of the forces, to be achieved by September 2005. However, an August 2005 AU update reported that the deployment of five of the mandated battalions had yet to occur.[8]

The shortcomings of the AU's ability to protect civilians in Darfur are recognizable and continuing, as of this writing. Despite lessons learned in Burundi, the AU is still plagued organizationally by a significant lack of tactical and operational-level intelligence to support peacekeeping operations. The JAM assessment lists problems and shortcomings in command and control, SOPs, human and material resources, and communications between AU headquarters in Addis, its office in Khartoum and AMIS headquarters in El Fasher. The AU does not have an effective intelligence-gathering capacity and it is severely understaffed with intelligence analysts. This has resulted in a painfully slow process of transferring actionable intelligence from the strategic to operational level.[9] Moreover, as reported by the International Crisis Group in a July 2005 policy briefing, there is no clear delineation of responsibilities at the strategic, operational and tactical levels, adding to the already confusing situation.[10]

Although the U.S., EU, UN, and NATO are all now participating in a variety of roles to assist the AU mission, the organization itself continues to lack basic resources critical to peacekeeping and stability operations. In addition to the absence of strategic airlift capacity, its Mi-8 helicopters are insufficient for patrols as they lack the ability to conduct operations at night. Logistical elements needed to sustain the mission in-theater are insufficient, with no large troop-transport vehicles and limited ground transportation capacities. As mentioned above, force generation continues to be a problem, with troop contributing countries (TCC) experiencing both financial constraints and political unwillingness in cobbling together suitable numbers of troops to fulfill pledges and suitable equipment to protect them. Armored personnel carriers (APCs) were recently sent in but did not constitute a suitable number to allow for patrolling of such a large area.

Another issue that has continued to undermine AU efforts in deploying an all-African peacekeeping force is the lack of uniform training at the state level. While the various regions, to a certain extent, all receive external donor training for peacekeeping missions, this has not translated into TCC interoperability on the ground. Beyond language difficulties, equipment and training standards vary widely. Although Africa has regional peacekeeping training centers that, in some cases, seek to address the issue of standardizing training, many are still in their infancy. The Kofi Annan International

[7] "The African Union Mission in Sudan: Technical and operational dimensions" Henri Boshoff in African Security Review Vol 14 No 3 (2005)
[8] AU Darfur Integrated Task Force Information Update No. 3, August 7, 2005
[9] Findings from the report of the Joint Assessment Mission to Sudan, March 10-12, 2005.
[10] "The AU's Mission in Darfur: Bridging the Gaps," International Crisis Group Africa Briefing no. 28. July 2005. Available online at: http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?l=1&id=3547

Peacekeeping Training Centre in Ghana (KAIPTC) and the Kenya Peacekeeping Training Centre (KPTC) are, by far, the most advanced attempts to standardize African training for peacekeeping. However, the KAIPTC has been operational for less than two years and the Nairobi centre would benefit from more funding and equipment. Peacekeeping training centers in Senegal, Mali, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe also exist as regional attempts, supported by donor assistance, to standardize and harmonize training on the continent.

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

ECOWAS, headquartered in Abuja, Nigeria, has intervened both politically and militarily in several conflicts in West Africa, most notably in Sierra Leone, Cote d'Ivoire and Liberia. ECOWAS' most recent intervention in Liberia in the summer of 2003 demonstrated a marked improvement from its previously questionable human rights record in the first Liberia intervention six years earlier. However, the organization remains dependent on outside help in both planning and execution. The early warning and monitoring unit is staffed with American, British and French military personnel who assist in the daily operations and have helped to plan and execute the interventions in Sierra Leone and Cote d'Ivoire. The Liberia intervention was largely planned by retired American military and senior civilian experts, some of whom were fortuitously in Abuja at the time for a conference. Most information gathered, however, comes from local and international media and is often processed as events transpire rather than facilitating an early warning capacity.[11] Additionally, the Secretariat as a whole suffers from a severe lack of institutional capacity to process outside funding targeted at improving the day-to-day operations of the organization. A lack of simple telecommunications equipment, fax machines, reliable internet connections, coupled with a lack of knowledge on how to administer outside funding with accountability, has severely constrained operations. In certain instances, donor funding in excess of 1 million euros has simply been allowed to languish, as there are no coherent mechanisms or sufficient human resources to process the funds.[12]

Despite these significant shortcomings, ECOWAS must be credited for attempting to resolve crises in West Africa using a subregional peacekeeping force. ECOWAS has intervened more than any other regional organization to stop conflict. Due to the highly interdependent nature of conflict in West Africa, with one state's collapse quickly destabilizing another, ECOWAS has acted quickly when mounting an intervention. This has been due, in large part, to Nigeria's lead role. Most of the burden within ECOWAS falls on Nigeria. In both Sierra Leone and Liberia, Nigeria committed the bulk of the human, logistical and financial resources to the missions. Nigerian leadership has also facilitated successful diplomatic resolutions to conflicts in West African states. Within the organization, there have been tensions based on what other members view as Nigeria's overwhelming dominance. However, given the resources needed to keep the peace in the subregion, it is likely that Nigeria will continue to play the lead role.[13]

[11] FfP interviews, Washington, DC and Abuja, Nigeria, October 2003.
[12] FfP interviews, European Embassies and ECOWAS headquarters, Abuja, October 2003.
[13] FfP interviews, Abuja, October 2003.

ECOWAS has asserted the normative right to intervene in conflicts that threaten the subregion. In 1999, ECOWAS adopted the Protocol Relating to the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security. The Protocol allows the organization to use force to intervene in a member state to stop a humanitarian emergency and other threats to the security of the subregion. The adoption of the Protocol is significant as it institutionalizes a mechanism for conflict resolution rather than relying on ad-hoc approaches when violence breaks out. It also demonstrates the organization's willingness to place human security above state sovereignty, which was an impediment to action in the past.

ECOWAS has also moved to establish a rapid-deployment capacity within the organization's military element, the ECOWAS Ceasefire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG). The plan, announced in 2004, calls for the establishment of the ECOWAS Task Force, comprised of national contingents that are specifically designated to be available to deploy rapidly in case of a crisis in a member state. The proposed force would include 1,500 rapid reaction troops, a follow-on brigade of 3,500, and a reserve force of 1,500.[14] It is unclear when the Task Force will be fully operational, given the already sizable resource constraints on member states.

Overall, ECOWAS has been the most robust organization in Africa willing to address security issues from a regional standpoint. Its willingness to use force to stop humanitarian crises has also been repeatedly demonstrated. However, political will needs resources to be effective. ECOWAS faces a serious lack of capacity and remains dependent on outside countries for support. For example, the U.S. contractor, Pacific Architects and Engineers (PAE), provided the logistical support and resources to ECOWAS in Liberia. Militarily, it is reliant on Nigeria, which does not possess the logistical capacities to mount a swift intervention without U.S. or European assistance. ECOWAS is also unable to sustain its troops in a theater of operations without assistance and relatively quick UN follow-on. Costs to the organization for peacekeeping are also massive and mostly absorbed by Nigeria.

ECOWAS has also faced continued difficulties regarding training and the interoperability of the military forces of its member states. These divisions largely exist between Anglophone and Francophone states. Outside donor training and equipment programs provided by the U.S., UK, and France has tended to exacerbate these differences rather than ameliorate them. As the main providers of training and equipment to West Africa, donor nations have yet to develop a more unified strategy that encourages harmonization between countries. Finally, ECOWAS had not developed clear rules of engagement nor has it developed a division of labor with the AU or the UN. Although the handovers to the UN from ECOWAS forces in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Cote d'Ivoire went relatively smoothly, this is largely due to the fact that most were simply "re-hatted" from ECOWAS to UN troops. Clear guidelines and procedures still need to be developed for future missions.

[14] "Defense Chiefs Approve Establishment of Rapid Reaction Force," ECOWAS Press Release, June 18, 2004.

The Southern African Development Community (SADC)

The Southern African Development Community's (SADC) main military intervention in Lesotho, in 1998, was spearheaded by South Africa with some support from Botswana. There was a smaller intervention in the DRC in 1998. However, these were basically unilateral and exceptional cases. In general, although South Africa possesses the military capacities and manpower to mount a successful intervention to halt a humanitarian crisis, several key factors, including an aging military force and an alarming AIDS rate among military personnel, have undermined its capacity to act. Additionally, South Africa, along with Nigeria, contributes the bulk of forces to peacekeeping operations on the continent and is continually confronted with increasing demand on its resources. Within SADC itself, a charter mandating consensus before action and a refusal to confront the Mugabe regime in Zimbabwe has led to the organization's isolation from many outside sources of political and monetary support, most prominently the U.S. and Great Britain.[15] While some SADC member states believe that South Africa exercises too much political and economic control, grudgingly they admit that they would need South African military resources to mitigate effectively any subregional conflict.

There also exists a strong lack of political consensus within the organization as to SADC's responsibility in conflict prevention and mediation. Most members stress sovereignty over security, and there is no organizational consensus or normative values on human rights and democracy in the subregion. The SADC Protocol on Politics, Defense and Security Cooperation calls for the establishment of an early warning capacity within the organization but it contains no language about incorporating the normative right to intervene to stop a humanitarian crisis. Although the Protocol has been ratified, it has not yet been implemented. This is not likely to change in the near future, as there is little impetus, particularly with Mugabe still in power in Zimbabwe, to implement more forceful practices in regard to managing conflicts in the subregion.

As mentioned earlier, despite lagging behind subregional organizations like ECOWAS in adopting more coercive measures to prevent and respond to conflict, SADC has come the furthest in meeting the requirement for the formation of a Southern Africa standing brigade. Heavily coordinated and financed by South Africa, it has met the first phase outlined by the AU, with 6,000 troops pledged, a finalized structure, and an approved logistics system. Thus, while SADC may not be willing to intervene as an organization in the region's conflicts, it has demonstrated its support of AU efforts. It remains questionable, however, whether it will actually use this capacity to stop humanitarian emergencies.

[15] In an interview with the FfP in December of 2003, a official at the South African Ministry of Defense related that South Africa's refusal to support the U.S.-led invasion in Iraq was also believed to play a key role in the decision of the U.S. not to move forward on contracts to provide South Africa with enhanced military capacities, particularly in the field of air transport. This claim has not been substantiated.

The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

In East Africa, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) has, as mentioned above, primarily played the role of a platform organization for regional diplomacy in the two longest running civil wars on the continent, Sudan and Somalia. Although, through member states like Kenya and Ethiopia, the organization possesses well-trained and equipped military personnel who could be mobilized to intervene in a crisis should the organization take up the mantle, it has not yet moved into that arena. IGAD has focused rather on the provision of good offices and the creation of confidence building measures (CBMs) to move the stalled peace process in Sudan and Somalia forward, with Kenya providing both the venue and the main source of political support. With strong international support from the United States and Europe, IGAD scored a victory in January 2005 when, after 11 years of on-and-off negotiations, the warring Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the Government of Sudan signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), formally ending one of Africa's longest and deadliest internal conflicts.[16]

Interestingly, although IGAD has not developed a military capability for responding to threats to regional security, it has begun developing a comprehensive system of early warning indicators for local disputes among pastoralists and agriculturalists. However, IGAD plans to further develop the indicators to encompass a wider spectrum of potential threats. Information is primarily gathered by sending local staff into the field to conduct exhaustive surveys that are then processed at IGAD's continental early warning and response mechanism (CEWARN) headquarters, in Addis Ababa. Although labor intensive and time consuming, the fact-gathering missions might serve as a sound basis for reliable early warning information in remote areas out of the reach of the government and media sources.[17]

National Capacities in Selected Countries

As mentioned above, both Nigeria and South Africa contribute significant peacekeeping capacities to both the AU and UN peacekeeping missions in Africa. South Africa makes up the bulk African forces in the Congo and Burundi, and Nigeria comprises the majority of troops in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Both countries have taken the lead in interventions in their specific regions and have considerable experience in UN peacekeeping missions. While Nigeria has the financial resources and manpower to undertake a wide-scale peacekeeping operation, it lacks the logistical and airlift capacities to deploy swiftly and maintain an extended presence on the ground without the assistance of outside resources. For the ECOWAS intervention in Liberia in July of 2003, Nigeria had the personnel

[16] The CPA was the result of over two years of intense negotiations chaired by IGAD with international mediation efforts by the governments of the U.S., UK, Norway, and Italy, as well as the UN. Following the CPA, UN Security Council Resolution 1590 (25 March 2005) approved the deployment of a monitoring mission with strong military, CIVPOL, and civilian components to monitor the implementation of the CPA.
[17] FfP interviews, IGAD CEWARN headquarters, Addis Ababa, November 2003.

ready to deploy three weeks before it was able to secure U.S. assistance to airlift its forces in-theatre.[18]

South Africa, which has considerably more logistical and airlift resources, is able to deploy more rapidly to areas of operation in Africa but also lacks the capacities to deploy rapidly to missions outside of Africa. For the time being, however, South Africa retains the best-equipped, best-trained and most easily deployable forces for peacekeeping in Sub-Saharan Africa and is able to sustain them for the longest amount of time without outside assistance. It should be noted, however, that the South African military is currently being ravaged by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Unlike Botswana, where HIV testing is mandatory for military personnel, South Africa does not test its armed forces for the virus and has been widely criticized for failing to do so. South Africa also suffers from an aging military force and an inability to recruit sufficient levels of young, healthy military personnel.[19]

Other countries, through U.S., French and British military training programs, such as ACOTA, RECAMP, and BMAT,[20] respectively, also have demonstrated diverse skills and adeptness at peacekeeping. Ghana is one of the largest African contributors of troops to both AU and UN peacekeeping operations and has generally been evaluated positively for its performance in these missions.[21] Like Nigeria, Ghana lacks the logistical and airlift capacities to deploy rapidly and other equipment needed for Chapter VII peacekeeping operations, such as armored personnel carriers (APCs).[22] Senegal, another West African country that benefits from both U.S. and French training programs, has a professional military that has performed well in peacekeeping operations but suffers from even poorer resources, such as uniforms and ammunition. However, as in most former French colonies in Africa, Senegal maintains a gendarmerie force which, when deployed as part of a Senegalese CIVPOL contingent, is able to provide the crucial intermediate force capabilities (riot control, investigation and arrest, counter-narcotics, and anti-terrorism) that regular civilian police and military personnel are not trained to perform. As these intermediate capacities are becoming increasingly valued in peacekeeping operations, Senegalese experience in this area might prove to be a valuable resource for future missions.[23]

In East Africa, both Kenya and Ethiopia contribute significant military and police capacities to peacekeeping operations, both on the continent and in other regions. South Africa and Ethiopia are the main military contributors along with Kenya in the United Nations Mission in Burundi (ONUB), and Kenya contributes a significant amount of peacekeepers to the UN Mission in Ethiopia-Eritrea (UNMEE). Both Kenya and Ethiopia maintain highly professional and well-equipped military forces although Kenya has a much longer, and well-praised, reputation for peacekeeping, particularly in the Balkans

[18] FfP interviews, ECOWAS headquarters and the Nigerian National Defense College, Abuja, October 2003.
[19] FfP interviews, South African National Defense Forces (SANDF) Headquarters, Pretoria, November 2003.
[20] ACOTA: African Contingency Operations Training Assistance; RECAMP: Renforcement des capacités africaines de maintien de la paix ; BMAT: British Military Advisory Teams.
[21] FfP interviews with ACOTA and BMAT trainers, Nairobi, October and November 2003.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid and FfP interviews with Senegalese Armed Forces.

missions in Bosnia and Kosovo where it has also provided police and police trainers.[24] Ethiopia largely benefits from U.S. training and financial assistance while Kenya, also a beneficiary of U.S. assistance, has maintained a long-standing military alliance with Britain. In terms of the professionalism of its police forces, while it does not have a gendarmerie capacity like Senegal, Kenya does carry on the British tradition of highly competent civil policing and its officers have performed admirably in a myriad of international environments and constitute a reliable capacity in Africa.[25] With its deployment of nearly two thousand troops to the AU mission in Darfur, Rwanda has signaled its desire to play a role in the future of African peacekeeping. Thus far, the Rwandese peacekeepers have received positive assessments by US and European military advisors and humanitarian NGOs on the ground in Darfur.

[24] FfP interviews with ACOTA and BMAT trainers, Nairobi, October and November 2003; FfP interviews with retired United Nations Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina (UNMBIH) officials and CIVPOL in Washington, DC, September 2003.

[25] FfP interviews, BMAT and ACTOA trainers and professional staff, Kenyan Defense Staff College Karen, Nairobi, November 2003.

THE AMERICAS

Review of Selected Organizations

- The Organization of American States (OAS)
- El Mercado Común del Sur/Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR)

The Organization of American States (OAS)

The OAS has been reluctant to apply coercive measures, not only when confronted with humanitarian emergencies like the Haiti crises of 1993 and 2004, but also when countries in the region flagrantly abuse the rule of law, suspend democratic processes, and perpetuate atrocities against their citizens. Although it successfully mediated the political crisis in Peru in 2000-2001, the OAS has continued to evidence its shortcomings as a regional body to effectively mitigate and manage most crises. Except for the crises in Haiti and Colombia, countries in Latin America and the Caribbean have weathered the internal political challenges in the past decade and inter-state disputes have lessened. However, the OAS lacks the capabilities to manage serious conflicts that have the potential of becoming humanitarian emergencies.

The OAS relies on unanimous member consensus before action and, like the UN, relies on its member states to provide the financial and military resources for undertaking an intervention. Beyond being hampered by the need for consensus and member state contributions, the OAS has failed to move beyond rhetoric in regard to activating its "Cooperative Security" principle outlined in Santiago in 1991. Although the OAS Democratic Charter outlines the need for an "inter-American system" of collective security based on the "defense of democratic systems of governance," it contains no actual mechanisms to mobilize an intervention in the event of a crisis.

The OAS also suffers from a lack of credibility on the part of some of its member states who view it as nothing more than a mouthpiece for the will of the United States. Its location in Washington and perceived instances of the U.S. "bullying" the OAS to concede to actions other member states deemed unacceptable has underscored this skepticism. Additionally, within the organization itself, there are sharp disagreements over the role of the organization as a protector and enforcer of democracy and human rights. Key nations such as Mexico refuse to consider the adoption of coercive mechanisms to enforce the right to intervene in intra-state conflicts. Despite acknowledgement on the part of many of its members that the hemisphere is facing new and emerging threats that fuel internal conflict and can lead to state collapse, the OAS has been unable to move beyond its original incarnation as a Cold War regional body, tasked with preserving state sovereignty.[26]

In 2001, the OAS adopted the Inter-American Democratic Charter in Lima, Peru in on the same day as the September 11th terrorist attacks on the U.S. The charter calls for the organization to take a stronger stance against member states that violate the principles of

[26] FfP interviews: Guatemala, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, June and July 2004.

democracy in the Americas. At the last OAS regional meeting in Florida in June 2005, a proposal by the U.S. to expand the charter to include the right to forcefully intervene to uphold democracy was met with fierce resistance. Venezuela, in particular, felt the U.S. proposal was directly aimed at preparing a path for armed intervention into the country to overthrow the government. Brazil and several other members also argued against the inclusion of any language that included the use of force or any means other than diplomatic intervention to end an internal crisis.[27] The ability of South American countries to play a more active role in protecting civilians in humanitarian emergencies is hampered by fears of a U.S. intervention, which are based on historical experience.

The OAS has had some success in post-conflict reconstruction, particularly in Central America. In Guatemala and Nicaragua, most notably, the OAS has launched successful campaigns for the eradication of landmines and for halting the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. Its programs aimed at encouraging civil society participation in good governance campaigns and transparency initiatives have also been reviewed positively by many Central American countries struggling to recover from devastating civil wars. Beyond action campaigns, the OAS has launched good governance training initiatives for both government and civil society actors and has generally progressed forward in these efforts. The OAS has thus garnered the greatest respect as a regional body from Central American nations for its targeted attempts to address the threats to security in specific countries. In most of South America, however, the OAS remains a body that is both physically and politically removed from daily realities. Overall, it is seen as an organization that should not be given the mandate to intervene in internal conflicts on any grounds, humanitarian or otherwise. The right to intervene militarily, from a regional perspective, remains solely the responsibility of the United Nations.[28]

El Mercado Común del Sur (MERCOSUR)

The other main regional body in the Americas is MERCOSUR, the Southern Common Market. Founded mainly as an organization to promote greater economic ties between the Southern Cone countries of Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay (Chile maintains an observer status), its member states, with the exception of Brazil, would largely like the organization to retain its central focus on the economic sector. Although member states of MERCOSUR have made progress in their bilateral and multilateral cooperation agreements targeted at specific areas, such as the eradication of landmines, nuclear non-proliferation and space exploration, they are wary of allowing the organization to take on a role in regional collective security. This is, in part, due to historical disputes both between member countries and the specific internal security concerns confronting states. While Brazil and Chile have recently made strides in increasing their participation and profiles in international peacekeeping operations, most notably in Haiti, traditional contributors, such as Argentina and Uruguay, are reluctant to undertake military interventions without an explicit UN mandate. The emerging cooperation of these actors in distinctly "Latin American-led" UN peacekeeping operations may, however, lead to a

[27] Please see: http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/americas/06/06/oas/?section=cnn_world
[28] FfP interviews: OAS regional office, Guatemala, June 2004.

more robust dialogue on the potential of MERCOSUR adopting a security-related agenda.[29]

National Capacities in Selected Countries

Countries in Central America are just beginning to consider contributing forces to peacekeeping operations after more than a decade of trying to recover from their own civil wars. Recently, Guatemala has taken the lead in Central America in regards to the number of troops sent to UN peacekeeping missions. It has a small number of forces joining the largely South American-led mission in Haiti and has announced its intentions to send a contingent to the UN mission in Liberia. Like other countries in Central America, Guatemala is confronting the need to downsize and transform its military in the post-war era. It has increasingly come to view peacekeeping operations as a viable tool both for training and professionalizing its armed forces. In the short-term, peacekeeping also provides a financial resource and a utility for its excess military personnel. The performance of Guatemalan troops in the field remains to be evaluated.[30]

In South America, there is both an emerging trend of new countries contributing to peacekeeping operations and the continuation of traditional peacekeeping contributors defining their foreign policy agendas through the lens of UN-led operations. The newest contributors, Brazil and Chile, deserve substantial consideration in what they have undertaken in Haiti. Brazil is not a traditional contributor to peacekeeping operations, but it has recently begun to see itself as an emerging leader in the Southern Hemisphere with a vested interest in gaining more credibility vis-à-vis the UN Security Council. When Haiti began to unravel again early in 2004 and it became clear that a robust follow-on UN presence would be needed after the initial U.S., Canadian, and French-led intervention, Brazil stepped forward and took on a lead role in the UN mission. Prior to its deployment of 1,216 troops and personnel in Haiti, Brazil had also taken part in peacekeeping operations in Portuguese-speaking missions, most notably in Mozambique and East Timor.

With limited experience in UN operations, Brazilian armed and naval forces have nonetheless been practicing peacekeeping operations since the mid-nineties. In the case of land forces, Brazil has considerable experience conducting both military and humanitarian operations in the Amazon jungle and along its borders with Colombia and Ecuador. Moreover, although Brazil does not have a gendarmerie or intermediate force capacity, both its police and armed forces have experience in riot control, arrest and interdiction, and border security. Given the unstable situation in Rio, the Brazilian government is debating whether to institutionalize a branch of the armed forces as a quasi-gendarmerie force by deputizing them to undertake robust policing in Rio's infamous *favellas.*[31]

[29] FfP interviews: Brazil, Argentina and Chile Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, June and July 2004.
[30] FfP interviews, Guatemala, June 2004.
[31] FfP interviews, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brasilia, July 2004.

Despite these national capacities, Brazil's leadership in Haiti has come under intense criticism in the past year for its timid performance. Although the mission mandate allows for the use of force to quell violence, criminal gangs and armed rebels have continued to roam the country and terrorize the population. A failure to quickly demobilize former members of the Haitian Armed Forces and other rebel militia groups has also left the country awash in arms. Since November 2004, the security situation in Haiti has deteriorated steadily, with rapes, beatings and murders sharply on the increase. International NGOs and human rights monitoring agencies have condemned Brazil's failure to take more forceful action against criminal gangs and other armed spoilers.[32] For its part, Brazil has been insistent that it will not revert to the widespread use of violence to combat the chaos, a position that was stated prior to the Brazilian takeover of the mission. [33]

Brazil approached the Haiti mission intent on "winning hearts and minds" rather than entering with guns blazing. In interviews with the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs in Brasilia, civilian and military staff rightly expressed that without a detailed focus on rebuilding crumbled Haitian institutions and empowering the Haitian people, no amount of force would set the country on the track to stability. Additionally, officials conveyed the belief that the U.S. approach to restoring human security through the use of force had proved insufficient in other peacekeeping missions. One official remarked that the continued need for a peacekeeping presence in Bosnia was reflective of the U.S. failure to build institutions and allow locals to regain a feeling of ownership for their own security. Brazil, at the outset of the MINUSTAH mission (UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti), seemed determined to win the favor of the local population first, and confront spoilers second.[34]

Unfortunately, as has been evidenced by the continued downward spiral of the mission in Haiti, the failure of the Brazilian leadership to use force to put down rogue elements has likely cost the "hearts and minds" they came to win. Although the UN failed to mandate enough police for the mission or grant them executive policing powers to disarm and subdue the gangs, Brazil has also not effectively confronted the violence. Amid the daily brutality and chaos, institution building has fallen by the wayside. National elections, originally scheduled for November 2005, have been postponed due to the unstable situation. While there have recently been increased instances of UN peacekeepers using deadly force to put down riots and sporadic outbreaks of fighting in Haiti, most observers have concluded that Brazil, as the lead nation, needed to set a stronger example earlier in the mission.[35]

---

[32] Please see reports by the International Crisis Group on Haiti. Available online at: http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=2899&l=1 Also, Refugees International Reports on Haiti available online at: http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/country/detail/2949/ For detailed reporting on the security situation in Haiti, please see: www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/haiti-background.htm

[33] Ibid and FfP interviews, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brasilia, July 2004.

[34] FfP interviews, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brasilia, July 2004.

[35] "UN Peacekeeping More Assertive, Creating Risk for Civilians." By Colum Lynch.in *The Washington Post*. Published August 15th, 2005.

At the same time, Chile has emerged as a competent and viable actor in peace enforcement and peacekeeping missions. Even less than Brazil, Chile had only contributed a nominal amount of forces to UN peacekeeping operations and had mostly concerned itself with engaging in bilateral and multilateral military training exercises with its neighbors and the U.S. When asked to assist the U.S. and French forces in a rapid deployment to Haiti, however, Chile exhibited some surprising capacities. Within 72 hours, the Chilean armed forces and navy had deployed a fully sustainable company that included a medical unit able to immediately administer services. Chile's ability to rapidly respond to U.S.-led requests for assistance has been the result of focus, over the past five years, on the modernization of its armed and naval forces to the level of NATO compatibility. In doing so, the Chilean government has purchased F-16 fighter jets as well as C-130s and a variety of lift and transport equipment that has allowed Chile to rapidly deploy and sustain its forces in a theatre of operation.[36]

Although several top officers in the Chilean Ministry of Defense said that peacekeeping operations are "not a business for Chile," the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and branches of the armed services agreed that, based on the results of the Haiti mission, Chile will continue to explore participation in peacekeeping operations as both a tool to build closer alliances with its neighbors and an opportunity for its military to gain training experience.[37] Currently, Chile has approximately 600 troops and civilian police in Haiti and, unlike Brazil, it has demonstrated its willingness to forcibly deter violence from the onset. According to the U.S. advocacy group, Refugees International, which visited Haiti in the spring of 2005, "In Cap-Haïtien, the Chilean battalion was omnipresent, conducting vehicle and foot patrols, guarding intersections and directing traffic. These activities continued after dark."[38]

Santiago is also the location of Chile's new and highly functional peacekeeping training center, CECOPAZ. A visit to the center revealed an impressive array of both technologically advanced training and simulation modules as well as a professional, and multinational training staff. The training center also serves to train international military and police as well as NGOs and other civilian elements for peacekeeping operations.[39] Chile also has an intermediate force capacity, the *Carabineros*, which participate in peacekeeping training and have earned a reputation for both flexibility and neutrality in peace support operations. Like other gendarmerie forces in the region, the Chilean *Carabineros* are modeled on the Italian *Carabinieri.* They provide force protection for Chilean armed forces deployed abroad and can operate independently in peacekeeping operations. Finally, Chile has also begun to take an interest in the provision of rule of law components to peace support operations. Chilean judges and prosecutors, in the post-Pinochet era, have worked to earn a reputation for fairness and professionalism and may,

[36] FfP Interviews, Chilean Ministry of Defense and Joint Forces Headquarters, Santiago, July 2004.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Refugees International report available online:
http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/article/detail/5428
[39] FfP interviews, CECOPAC, Santiago, July 2004.

in the future, provide this as a deployable capacity for peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention operations.[40]

Argentina and Uruguay are the region's oldest and most experienced peacekeeping contributors, both with experience in the first UN missions in the Middle East. Argentina has long considered peacekeeping as part of its foreign policy agenda and has performed well in the multitude of operations to which it has contributed. In the post-junta era, the use of the armed forces and the gendarmerie in peacekeeping operations was seen as a vital tool to improve the country's reputation, both domestically and internationally, after the full extent of human rights abuses committed by the armed forces under the military dictatorship were revealed. Argentina contributes both land and naval forces to peacekeeping operations and currently comprises, after Brazil and Chile, the third-largest presence in Haiti with plans to increase its forces and police. Unlike Chile, however, Argentina does not possess the airlift capacity of its neighbor and relies mainly on the UN to transport its forces. In the Haiti mission, however, Argentina was able to use its navy to get forces to the country although this was likely a one-time arrangement.[41]

Argentina also has a peacekeeping training school, CAECOPAZ, which works closely with the General Staff of the Armed Forces to ensure that all Argentinean peacekeepers receive comprehensive training in all aspects of PKOs including negotiation and mediation techniques. Argentina's training center, along with Chile's, serves as one of the two regional centers where students from other countries make up a significant percentage of those trained. While CAECOPAZ does not have the high-tech capacities found at the Chilean CECOPAC training center, it has a very strong reputation for professionalism in training and drawing on lessons learned from prior operations.[42]

Recent changes in Argentinean law have taken the final decision-making process on contributions to peacekeeping operations away from the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs and have made it a parliamentary duty. It was noted by several ministers in both departments that this may, at least in the short-term, serve to lessen the number of peacekeepers that Argentina is willing to contribute, as Parliament does not favor Argentinean participation as much as the two ministries. Additionally, the financial crisis that struck Argentina in 2001 is still being felt in all sectors of society, including the armed services. Of the $10 million outlaid for training, equipping and transporting troops and police to Haiti, Argentina only expects to recoup a little more than $3 million. This, it was noted, more than political considerations, would be the main disincentive for Argentina to support future contributions. At both the public and governmental level, however, Argentina remains strategically committed to peacekeeping as a foreign policy strategy.[43]

[40] FfP interviews, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense & Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (PUC) Santiago, July 2004.
[41] FfP interviews, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, Buenos Aires, July 2004.
[42] FfP interviews, CAECOPAZ, Buenos Aires, July 2004.
[43] Ibid footnote n. 55

Like Chile, Argentina has a gendarmerie force that has been deployed alongside its armed forces in peacekeeping operations for years. In addition, Argentina has a specialized training center for its gendarmerie peacekeepers, Centro de Capacitación para Misiones en el Exterior (CENCAMEX). In Bosnia and Kosovo, the gendarmerie has, at different times, functioned as a critical part of the Multinational Specialized Unit (now the IPU) and the Special Police Unit (SPU), similar structures utilizing the intermediate force capacities of gendarmerie or constabulary units. In both settings, the Argentinean gendarmerie has provided critical capacities in riot control and counter-narcotics, weapons, and human trafficking as well as investigation and arrest.[44] While gendarmerie forces in both Argentina and Chile are also highly valued at home, their presence in peacekeeping operations that fall within the "Chapter Six-and-a-half" category should continue to be assessed in light of the challenges posed by complex operations that require an intermediate force capacity.[45]

Uruguay, in relation to its size and population, is the single largest contributor of peacekeepers to UN peacekeeping missions. Like Argentina, Uruguay embraces peacekeeping as part of its foreign policy agenda and has a longstanding reputation for professionalism. Unlike Argentina, Chile, and Brazil, however, Uruguay is reluctant to get involved in peacekeeping operations in the Americas, believing that it could potentially present a breach in neutrality and open the door for potential "neighborhood" problems. Thus, Uruguayan armed and naval forces are mainly deployed in Africa, with the Congo mission comprising the largest percentage of forces. While Uruguay is contributing to the mission in Haiti, several parliamentary and ministry officials underscored that the country sees its highest value in UN operations that are outside of the hemisphere.[46]

Uruguay has a peacekeeping training school attached to its army headquarters but does not train a large number of foreign officers. According to several governmental and army officials, however, Uruguay has repeatedly earned high marks for its ability to interact and operate with a wide variety of international peacekeeping contributors. Uruguay also has a reputation for fostering community interaction and providing dispute and mediation resolution capabilities, through its armed forces, in peacekeeping operations. More than any other country visited in Latin America, including Brazil, Uruguay embraces an approach to peacekeeping operations that views the "soft" side of peacekeeping as fundamental. Unfortunately, the Congo mission has begun to demonstrate the stress of this particular operation on Uruguayan peacekeepers and, because of instances of physical and psychological illness appearing among its troops, members of the Uruguayan Congress have taken an increasingly hard-line on future peacekeeping contributions. Instances of peacekeepers returning home and committing suicide and a

[44] For a detailed look at the modern use of constabulary forces in peacekeeping operations, please see: "Where is the Lone Ranger When We Need Him? America's Search for a Postconflict Stability Force" by Robert M. Perito. USIP press, Washington, DC, 2004. www.usip.org

[45] FfP interviews, Buenos Aires, July 2004.

[46] FfP interviews, Montevideo, July 2004. *Since these original interviews were conducted, Uruguay has increased its peacekeeping contributions to MINUSTAH significantly, now having almost 800 troops deployed in Haiti. This may be a signal of a greater willingness to participate in UN operations in the Americas in the future.

sharp hike in cases of domestic abuse perpetrated by troops have been a cause of concern in the Uruguayan press and in political circles.[47]

Additionally, recent scandals in the Congo surrounding UN peacekeepers' alleged involvement in sex slavery, robbery and trafficking have also soured both the Uruguayan government and public on the utility of maintaining such a high level of forces in UN operations. While the financial benefits for the armed forces and Uruguay society as a whole continue to play a critical role in Uruguay's attitudes towards peacekeeping, an evaluation is underway to determine the cost-benefit analysis of peacekeeping in Uruguay's future.[48] It is important to note, however, that due to the high level of participation in peacekeeping by the Uruguayan army over the past five decades, almost 80% of its active military forces have had at least one year of experience abroad in a UN mission.[49] This, in itself, underscores Uruguay's impressive experience and capacity for future operations.

[47] FfP interviews, Montevideo, July 2004.
[48] Uruguay, unlike many other UN peacekeeping-contributing countries, allots the entire amount of the UN stipend to their troops, which then encourages direct investment in the Uruguayan economy. Statistics have shown that through this system, the economy has benefited from a continuous cycle of direct investment in real estate as soldiers, often from poor backgrounds, use the money from UN peacekeeping to buy homes and make other property and goods purchases.
[49] FfP interviews, Montevideo, July 2004.

ASIA

Review of Selected Organizations

Organization
- The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), founded in 1967, has boasted the ability to prevent conflict among its member states through processes of cordial dialogue, also dubbed "the ASEAN way". Overall, of all the regional and subregional organizations, ASEAN is the furthest away from embracing a role as a security-based regional alliance. Like the OAS, ASEAN also invokes the principle of unanimous member consensus before moving forward on any initiative. This has vastly limited the abilities of more forward-thinking member states to push through proposals on regional peacekeeping forces and a collective security agenda. Unlike the Americas, however, the region continues to be mired in conflicts that have necessitated outside military and political interventions, East Timor and Mindanao being the most recognizable. In addition, numerous small-scale conflicts persist, particularly in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Southern Thailand, which have the likelihood of spreading and posing a threat to regional security.

Notably, while ASEAN as a regional body has not been willing to act in a collective fashion to directly confront threats posed by such conflicts, individual member states have made collective monitoring agreements that have strengthened alliances bilaterally, particularly in Southeast Asia. In the case of the separatist conflict in the Philippines, for example, Malaysia was recently asked to deploy a military monitoring group to ensure that human rights were upheld. Indonesia, after the Australian-led intervention in East Timor, asked Thailand to send a monitoring force to the troubled region of Aceh, although it later asked the monitors to leave.[50]

The Indonesian experience with outside interventions in its separatist conflicts was one of the main factors behind its proposal, at the 2004 ASEAN regional security summit, to create an ASEAN peacekeeping force. Although the intervention in East Timor was purportedly requested by Indonesia, in reality, the country gave into intense international pressure to stop human rights abuses perpetrated by the Indonesian military, leading the way for the Australian-led intervention. As Aceh and several other small-scale insurgencies continued to simmer within the country, Indonesia came to the conclusion that if another intervention were to occur, it would be far preferable to have a peacekeeping force comprised of its neighbors rather than "Western" actors.[51] While certain countries, Malaysia and the Philippines in particular, greeted the proposal

[50] FfP interviews with the Ministries of Defense of Thailand and the Philippines, October and November 2004.
[51] FfP interviews, Jakarta, November 2004.

positively, most other ASEAN nations strongly opposed it based on the ASEAN principle of non-intervention. Vietnam, Cambodia, Singapore, and Thailand were all in strong opposition, fearing it would grant other countries the right to intervene in conflicts occurring within their own states while also forcing the organization's hand in dealing with the continuing problem of Myanmar.[52]

ASEAN has been called upon by several Western states and international groups to take a stronger role in condemning the deplorable record of Myanmar, particularly in regard to human rights abuses and the jailing of members of the political opposition. However, most members of ASEAN are strongly opposed to the creation of a military capacity that might eventually be pressured to intervene. Moreover, certain countries in the region, the Philippines and Singapore in particular, are also seen by other ASEAN members as having close military relationships with the West, raising suspicions that these countries would be more susceptible to using a regional peacekeeping force at the behest of Western nations.[53] Despite these concerns and the opposition to the proposal from most of ASEAN's member states, there is a fledgling willingness, at least on the part of several members, to consider regional solutions to the conflicts occurring in Southeast Asia.

National Capacities in Selected Countries (Northeast & Southeast Asia)

While East Asia as a region has not been noted for its contributions to UN peacekeeping missions, several countries possess capacities that have been utilized successfully in both interventions and post-conflict stabilization operations. As noted above, ASEAN has been the least proactive on military interventions for humanitarian purposes but, among its member states and neighbors, several countries have recently begun to view their participation in peacekeeping operations as a method to both professionalize their armed forces and improve their national image. This regional trend in East Asia is very similar to Latin America.

Because its constitution limits the use of force to self-defense, Japan is currently debating changing or reinterpreting this clause in order to be able to undertake wider operations. Japan has contributed to UN operations before, although mainly through the use of its Self Defense Forces to deliver humanitarian aid and rebuild and restore destroyed infrastructures. Japanese experience in this capacity is fairly extensive. Additionally, Japan possesses the capacity to provide logistical support for peacekeeping missions and has contributed both humanitarian and logistical aid to support U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Although these arrangements have been made bilaterally with the U.S., Japan has also provided these services, on a limited level, to the UN in Namibia and East Timor.[54] Moreover, several regional crises, including the December 2004 tsunami disaster, have shown that the Japanese are highly adept at search-and-rescue missions and can mobilize and react to natural emergencies quickly.

[52] FfP interviews, ASEAN representation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Thailand, October 2004.
[53] FfP interviews, Singapore Institute of International Affairs, Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Singapore and the Philippines, October and November, 2004.
[54] FfP interviews, Tokyo, October 2004.

Although Japan does not posses a gendarmerie of intermediate force capacity, it does have police forces that receive advanced training in riot and crowd control. Most notably in Cambodia and East Timor, Japanese police officers proved to be extremely adept in this capacity. Japan has integrated riot control, force protection and criminal investigation courses into its national police training. In the limited instances in which its police have been deployed abroad, they have acted swiftly and decisively in crisis situations. While Japan has no plans to deploy its police independently of the Self Defense Forces in any present or future peacekeeping or stability operation, a highly professionalized and competent policing capacity defines Japanese participation. Additionally, like many G-8 countries, Japan possesses some of the most evolved logistics and communications technology, which, if the country decides to become a more active contributor, will be a major asset in future peace and stability operations.[55]

Like Japan, China has not been noted for its contributions to peacekeeping operations, other than as military observers. However, it is also beginning to send both military and police contingents to UN missions. Currently, Chinese troops and police are contributing to the UN missions in Liberia (UNMIL) and the Congo (MONUC), while it has recently sent 133 police officers to Haiti. China also opened its first peacekeeping training center in 2004 and, according to several government-run think tanks that advise the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, has begun to embrace peacekeeping as a method for strengthening its voice on the UN Security Council. As one individual stated, "China is being pressured to provide the experience behind its votes to veto or go forward with a peacekeeping mission." It has also been speculated that, as Japan is moving more towards a greater role in peacekeeping missions and strengthening its bi-lateral relations with the U.S., China is stepping forward to assume a more proactive role, as far as providing "boots on the ground" to UN missions. A closer evaluation of actual military and police capacities remains difficult due to the nature of the government, and it remains to be seen what China can bring, as a nation, to future stability and post-conflict operations.[56]

In Southeast Asia, several counties are providing small contingents to peacekeeping and post-conflict operations while others have provided rapid response capabilities, usually as a result of a bilateral arrangement, even though they do not envisage peacekeeping as part of their foreign policy agendas. Some other countries in Southeast Asia are still attempting to recover from outside interventions on their own territory and, as a result, are reluctant to participate in any perceived violation of sovereignty, even at the request of the UN.

Indonesia and the Philippines are contributing the most troops abroad to UN missions. As of 2005, there are approximately 200 troops and police from Indonesia in Africa and the

[55] Ibid.

[56] FfP interviews, Beijing, October 2004. *It should be noted that while the FfP was unable to meet with Chinese officials in the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, it was able to meet with all of the main "think tanks" that advise these ministries on a daily basis. The FfP was also given high-level access to former Chinese diplomats and scholars in Beijing.

Philippines has approximately 500 peacekeepers serving in UN missions, mostly in Africa and Haiti. Both countries are currently combating separatist rebellions of their own and deploy a significant amount of military and police resources to these areas.[57] The Indonesian military, although it has conducted multilateral training exercises with its neighbors and Western nations in counter-terrorism activities, still suffers from the legacy of alleged human rights abuses committed against civilians in Aceh and East Timor. Although Indonesian Ministry of Defense and Foreign Affairs officials maintain that, overall, the Indonesian military, particularly the army, is highly trained and professionalized, they are quick to admit that Indonesia is mostly focused on internal threats and bi- and multilateral anti-terrorism exercises more than out-of-area operations. After 35 years of dictatorship, both the armed services and police are still attempting to redefine and restructure their roles under civilian authority and will probably only continue to pledge sparingly to outside operations. Indonesia does, however, envision becoming the home of a future regional peacekeeping training center, similar to the one in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, as a way to become more integrated with both its neighbors and the international community and improve the overall reputation of its armed forces.[58]

Like Indonesia, the Philippines has long been engaged in an internal conflict in Mindanao as well as other low-intensity conflicts throughout the country. The Philippines enjoys a special relationship with the U.S. as a former colony and it has benefited from decades of U.S. training and assistance to its armed forces and police. In particular, the Filipino police are noted for their crowd and riot control (CRC) capacities and have performed well in peacekeeping and monitoring operations in Indonesia and Africa.[59] The Philippine armed forces have also benefited from ongoing anti-terrorism exercises with neighboring countries and the U.S., and they have generally been evaluated as capable and professional.[60] Again, as in Indonesia, the Philippine military is currently engaged mostly in trying to contain or resolve internal crises and has come under criticism for human rights abuses against civilians in these conflicts. In addition to suffering from a general lack of funding for its armed services, the Philippines relies almost exclusively on outside countries, such as Australia and the U.S., for logistical and transportation support in any operation conducted outside of its territory. Given the degree of professionalism and experience of its police, the Philippines is concentrating on training more individuals for UN CIVPOL operations.[61]

Another country that has not been a long-standing contributor to peacekeeping or post-conflict operations but enjoys a solid reputation for military professionalism and the rapid provision of humanitarian assistance is Thailand. Particularly in East Timor as a troop-contributing nation and in Aceh as an Indonesian-invited monitoring force, Thailand has shown strong capacities in a wide range of activities that have been evaluated positively

[57] Although a peace agreement was reached in August 2005 between the separatist rebels in Aceh and the Indonesia government, there still continues to be an separatist insurgency in Papua.
[58] FfP interviews, Jakarta, October 2004.
[59] FfP interviews, Singapore, Jakarta, Manila, October 2004.
[60] Please see U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) website for speeches and transcripts related to exercises and evaluations: http://www.pacom.mil/speeches/speeches.shtml
[61] FfP interviews, Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, Manila, October 2004.

by both host nations and other countries.[62] Thailand's first peacekeeping mission under UN auspices was in Cambodia (UNTAC) where it provided two engineer battalions. In Aceh, Thai monitors proved particularly adept at communicating and mediating between the local population and Indonesian forces and, although they were later asked to leave as tensions increased in the province, have since been praised by both the Achenese and Indonesian military for professionalism and neutrality. Thailand currently has approximately 200 peacekeepers deployed abroad, most to the UN mission in Burundi.

The UN has asked the Thai government to contribute to a standby alert capacity by providing a light infantry battalion at the ready to deploy within thirty days to a UN peacekeeping operation. Currently, Thailand has a light infantry and armored battalion as well as a medical unit pre-identified to deploy to an operation. As it has only one C-130 transport plane, it would, however, need to rely on outside nations or the UN to get its forces in theatre quickly. Thailand has also moved to institutionalize its peacekeeping policy by creating a peace operations division in its Ministry of Defense and, in 2000, Thailand established a peacekeeping training center in the headquarters of the Royal Thai Armed Forces.[63]

The tiny country of Singapore has also demonstrated some strong capacities to rapidly mobilize and deploy to peacekeeping operations although it does not foresee increased participation as part of its future foreign policy. Singapore's small size makes it difficult for the country to contribute significant numbers to peacekeeping operations. The country sees more of a role for itself in participating at the command staff level of operations and at UN peacekeeping headquarters in New York. At the Singapore Armed Forces training college, both commanders and soldiers receive training in peacekeeping but most lack experience in a peacekeeping environment. Officials at the Singapore Ministry of Defense admitted that this had been problematic in East Timor, the only mission to date where Singapore provided a company of combat troops and eventually took over the command of the mission. Joint patrols and close work with the New Zealand military in East Timor, however, provided Singapore with the proper level of readiness to take command.

Singapore proved to be quite impressive in its command and performance in East Timor, particularly its rapid mobilization for the mission. Within 12 hours, Singapore had helicopters and transport ships ready to provide to the initial Australian-led intervention force. Singapore also possesses airlift capacities and has purchased C130s and KC135s from the U.S. However, despite Singapore's capacities and experience in East Timor, the government views that mission as a "one time only" large-scale deployment of Singapore troops, equipment and logistical support. In the future, Singapore plans to focus on providing niche capabilities, such as medical units and landing ships. Unlike Malaysia, which keeps a minimum of two battalions on stand-by for deployment to peacekeeping

[62] Officials and former force commanders in Singapore and Indonesia repeatedly praised the professionalism of the Thai armed forces.
[63] FfP interviews, Bangkok, September 2004.

missions, the Singapore military has no future plans to designate specific units for peacekeeping.[64]

Although Singapore supports UN peacekeeping missions, it is opposed to participating in any peacekeeping operation under the aegis of regional organizations. Singapore was a vocal opponent to Indonesia's proposal that ASEAN develop institutional capacities for regional peacekeeping. It has been active in conducting joint exercises with Malaysia, Thailand, and Australia and would likely act in a "coalition of the willing" with its regional neighbors rather than under the UN or a regional body. The government and military are also focusing increasingly on the formation of bilateral ties with countries outside of the region. Singapore enjoys good relations with the U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) and plans to continue its participation in anti-terrorism exercises in the Straights of Malacca. There is a perception, however, of discord between PACOM and Washington, DC on the best strategies to pursue the anti-terrorism campaign in Southeast Asia. As one official remarked, "It is much easier to work with PACOM. Washington DC's agenda is too ambiguous and changing."[65]

An important training and coordination initiative for Asia-Pacific countries, held in Thailand, is Cobra Gold. Cobra Gold is part of a larger initiative called "Team Challenge" that provides a regional framework for countries to practice rapidly deploying emergency teams in a UN Chapter VII or non-combatant evacuation operation (NEO) setting. Cobra Gold was started in 1982 as joint training exercises conducted by the Royal Thai Navy and the U.S. Marines and Navy. It was later expanded to include Singaporean participation and, since 2004, has also included exercises with the Philippines, Mongolia, and Japan.[66] The PACOM-sponsored, Thai-hosted exercises were routinely cited as one of the most valuable training exercises for participating countries. Ministry of Defense and military representatives in Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippines all conveyed that Cobra Gold has been crucial in improving interoperability between participating nations and strengthening the capacities of each nation to provide rapid response in a humanitarian emergency.[67]

[64] FfP interviews, Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, Singapore, October 2004.
[65] Ibid.
[66] For more information on Cobra Gold, please see the official website: http://www.apan-info.net/cobragold/default.asp
[67] FfP interviews, Thailand, Singapore and the Philippines, October/November, 2004.

EUROPE

Review of Selected Organizations

Organizations
- The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)
- The European Union (EU)
- The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)

The OSCE has had mixed success in the countries in which it has deployed field missions. The achievements of the OSCE in the field seem to be linked to the clarity of the mandate it receives from headquarters in Vienna and the strength of the Head of Mission. Like the OAS and ASEAN, the OSCE also needs full member-state consensus before it can take action. Political goals of certain member states have blocked the issuance and renewal of mandates. In Georgia, where the OSCE maintained a successful border-monitoring mission with the breakaway republic of South Ossetia, Russia threatened to veto the entire OSCE budget if the mandate for the mission was renewed. In Bosnia, the OSCE had been implementing defense sector reform in close cooperation with NATO, which prompted Russia to block the mission's budget, for "paying for the political agendas of other countries."[68]

OSCE missions vary greatly by country. In Serbia, the OSCE has been working closely with the Serbian government and civil society on defense reform, drafting anti-corruption legislation, and building parliamentary capacities. Of all the missions visited, the Serbian OSCE operation seems to have realized the most successes in bridging the gap in a post-conflict setting between government and civil society in achieving the goals of the mission's mandate. It has also pursued more bilateral relationships with individual donor states.[69] While individuals from a few OSCE missions have complained that the "disconnection" from Vienna had led to a lack of direction, in certain missions it has fostered a better sense of local ownership.[70]

At headquarters in Vienna, there has been steady improvement in coordinating OSCE missions on a regional level, which target more cross-border cooperation in post-conflict zones. Regular meetings between Heads of Missions in the Balkans and Caucasus have improved communications and have led to better planning with headquarters. The 2006 chairmanship will be held by Slovenia, whose foreign minister cited better regional integration between missions as a target goal.[71] Despite these improvements, the organization is still tightly constrained by the need to have all member states approve its

[68] FfP interviews, OSCE Headquarters, Vienna, January 2005.
[69] FfP interviews, OSCE Belgrade, January 2005.
[70] FfP interviews, OSCE offices in Vienna, Belgrade, Sarajevo, Tbilisi, Pristina, January and February 2005.
[71] "Cold War Echoes" Dr. Dimitrij Rupel, *The Washington Post*, Opinion Editorial, March 7, 2005 Available online at: http://www.osce.si/clanki-intervjuji-2005-03-07-zda-washington-post.htm

budget. Plans to expand and open larger missions in Central Asia have been vetoed and officials in Vienna believe that while small-scale programs will continue to be funded, new and larger missions will not.[72]

In the Balkans, the OSCE mission in Bosnia has made significant progress implementing defense reforms and downsizing the military. It has also been successful in implementing reforms that will prepare Bosnia for NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) accession talks despite Russia's continued objection to the OSCE taking on this role. At the local level, however, the mission has been criticized for not connecting with civil society groups on democratization and education projects.[73] In Kosovo, the Kosovo Police Service School (KPSS) is widely considered one of the OSCE's greatest triumphs although it has seen some setbacks of late. The goal of creating a representative multiethnic police force was damaged considerably by the March 2004 riots in the province and the continued ethnic tensions between Kosovar Albanians and Serbians. Moreover, international trainers at the school related the growing problem of organized crime in deterring local police from performing their duties. "We know they are warned against reporting certain crimes and discouraged from working across ethnic lines, but we can't go out on patrol with them every day," one trainer said.[74] It is likely to get worse rather than better as final status talks draw nearer. The OSCE model for the school, however, is still considered the most successful post-conflict police training course and has been exported to Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, Georgia, and Nigeria.[75]

Overall, the OSCE has made improvements in working regionally with its own missions and also with NATO, the EU, and the UN. Where it continues to suffer a crisis of credibility is at the local level where it has been criticized for not fostering enough local participation in its programs. It also is continually hindered by the political ambitions of its member states, as they have the final say on whether a mission mandate is granted or extended. Moreover, as long as one member can veto the entire organization's budget, the OSCE will continue to be constrained in the actions it can take.

The European Union (EU)

In the past three years, the EU has made significant progress in expanding its role from a political and economic body to a military guarantor of stability in the region. It has also shown increasing willingness to intervene militarily in conflicts outside of Europe. In December of 2004, the EU took command of its largest military operation ever, taking over from NATO (SFOR) in Bosnia. Prior to the launch of Operation Althea in Bosnia, which replaced SFOR with the European Union Force (EUFOR), the EU had undertaken

[72] FfP intervies, OSCE Headquarters Vienna, January 2005.
[73] FfP interviews, OSCE offices Sarajevo, January 2005. The FfP also held a regional workshop in Budapest in January 2005 on the role of European civil society organizations in strengthening regional responses to conflict. The findings of the conference can be found at: http://www.fundforpeace.org/programs/rriw/building_capacity/bc-europe.pdf
[74] FfP interviews with international and local trainers at the Kosovo Police Service School. Pristina, February 2005.
[75] Ibid.

three smaller security operations. In the Balkans, the EU took over a NATO-led monitoring mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and assumed responsibilities for the International Police Task Force (IPTF) mission in Bosnia. It was the French-led EU mission to shore up the UN in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in July 2003, however, that underscored the willingness of the EU to use its military capacities to halt civilian casualties in Africa.

The EUFOR mission is an ambitious one. While, at the time of this writing, it is too early to determine if it will be successful, it is under the command of strong leadership with clear mission objectives. The three main thrusts of the EUFOR mission are to provide a deterrent force, strengthen joint military affairs (JMA) activities to tackle organized crime and bring war criminals to justice, and build local capacities. The current force size is 7,000, comprised mostly of NATO troops "re-hatted" under EU command. There is still a small official NATO presence, under U.S. command, that maintains the lead in defense sector reform and intelligence gathering, as well as aiding the EU with the apprehension of persons indicted for war crimes (PIFWICS). The country is divided into three other Multinational Task Forces under the commands of the UK, France, and Finland. Overall, there are 22 EU nations and 11 non-EU nations participating in Bosnia.[76]

Although the transition from a NATO-led operation to an EU-led force might have been problematic due to concerns over intelligence sharing and local perceptions that the mission was being "weakened," it has been a smooth transition. Officials in EUFOR have admitted that the mission is structured to provide a deterrent capacity and did not have the capacities to be "inserted into a crisis situation." The unlikely event of Bosnia returning to full-scale warfare has allowed the mission to focus on specific tasks, like combating organized crime, relying on the individual strengths of contributing nations. The former Multinational Specialized Unit, comprised of European gendarmerie forces, has been transformed into the EUFOR Integrated Police Unit (IPU) under Italian leadership. As most gendarmerie forces have training and expertise in fighting organized crime, establishing border security, and undertaking investigations, the IPU provides a crucial capability to the mission.[77]

The structure of EUFOR, subsequently streamlined under European Union Military Staff in Brussels, has eliminated many of the repetitious and confusing structures Dayton established. The dual-hatting of the UN High Representative to Bosnia, Lord Paddy Ashdown, as the EU Special Representative (EUSR) has also made communication and joint planning between the UN and EU much simpler. Communication between the EU forces and NATO occurs at the headquarters level between the U.S. commander of NATO forces in Bosnia, Brigadier General Louis Weber, and the EUFOR commander, Major General David Leakey. Both forces are co-located at mission headquarters in Camp Butmir, Sarajevo. The military chains of command between the EU and NATO are also coordinated through Berlin Plus arrangements at NATO's SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) and the EU's Operational headquarters at Mons.

[76] FfP interviews, EUFOR and NATO Headquarters, Camp Butmir, Sarajevo, January 2005.
[77] Ibid.

While the EUFOR operation is functioning well, a close examination of the EU Police Mission (EUPM) reveals a spotty record. When the EU replaced the IPTF in January 2003, it acquired the mandate to mentor and monitor local police forces as well as continue to build local capacities through training. The core areas identified in the EUPM mandate center around building police independence and accountability, combating organized crime and corruption, building financial sustainability, and increasing the capacities for institution building at the management level. The EUPM has approximately 900 personnel on the ground throughout the Republika Srpska and the Federation with 24 EU member states participating. The EU police commissioner reports directly to Lord Ashdown who, in turn, reports to the EU's High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), Javier Solana.

The EUPM has had some significant successes in the two years it has operated in Bosnia, including the establishment of court police, the institution of a program to combat human trafficking, and the creation of a crime-fighters hotline. In 2004, Lord Ashdown also established and empowered the State Investigation and Protection Agency (SIPA), a state-level law enforcement agency with executive powers. SIPA has been granted the authority to conduct investigations linked to organized crime, human trafficking, terrorism, and war crimes. Under the new EUFOR mandate, SIPA works closely with EU military and special police units, although coordination with NATO activities in these areas is not as clearly defined.

Unlike the IPTF, the EUPM is co-located with local police forces only at the middle and senior levels. EUPM police officers are not granted executive policing powers, do not carry weapons and do not have powers to investigate. While the intention of the EUPM mandate was to give local police forces a sense of "ownership" by serving as mentors and monitors, this proved to be a premature and ultimately faulty plan. Local police, ethnically divided and often grossly underpaid, have become susceptible to bribery, threats, and corruption. The EUPM has no powers to remove local police officers it finds guilty of participating in criminal activities or obstructing justice. It has also been sharply criticized at the local level for a "sit back and wait" approach rather than taking on an active role in mentoring Bosnian police forces. As one EUPM officer related, the high levels of crime and corruption in Bosnia discourage local police officers from turning to the EUPM for assistance: "They are much more likely to be threatened if they are seen to be cooperating with the internationals."

The EUPM mandate, slated to expire in 2005, is not likely to be renewed. Rather, a smaller follow-on presence will probably be established on a consultancy basis. The EU is, however, considering taking over police responsibilities from the OSCE in Kosovo as a possible first step in ultimately assuming full control of the peacekeeping mission. It is vital that lessons learned from Bosnia be closely examined before establishing a similar mandate for Kosovo. A larger presence that would enable EU officers to be co-located at the municipal level would be essential. Additionally, executive-policing powers should be granted from the outset to provide for a smooth transfer from the OSCE mission. Finally, while fostering local ownership of policing is fundamental, it should not prevent international monitors from reprimanding or dismissing officers who commit crimes.

In Africa, the EU has established two new missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and has been providing military training and support to the African Union mission in Darfur. In the DRC, a second EU Police Mission (EUPOL) is helping to establish and train an Integrated Police Unit (IPU), similar to the one in Bosnia that operates under Congolese command. In June of 2005, it opened a second mission, EUSEC R.D. Congo. This is a military initiative aimed at advising Congolese authorities on security policies that are consistent with international humanitarian law, good governance, and the rule of law.

The EU missions in Macedonia, Bosnia, and the DRC have all been carried out under the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). The ESDP is part of a wider European Security Strategy (ESS) that envisions the EU taking on a greater role in providing security in Europe as well as in Africa. At meetings in late 2004, a joint British-German-French proposal to create rapidly deployable EU "battle groups" was accepted. Initially, the number of combat-ready units planned was nine, each being comprised of 1,500 troops able to be deployed within ten days and sustainable in the field for a month. The number has since been increased to 13 battle groups, with France, the UK and Italy each taking responsibility for the initial three. Other EU member states plan to collaborate on the formation of the other ten. Although the battle groups can serve under a UN mandate, they will also be available to deploy independently, like the 2003 EU Artemis mission in the DRC. [78]

The EU plans to have two of the battle groups fully operational by 2007 but this has been hampered by the lack of resources available from member states. As most EU countries have force-level commitments to NATO, the battle groups will likely be simultaneously committed to both organizations. Since problems with force generation often hinder NATO planning, current EU goals may prove to be overly ambitious. Additionally, most EU member states also lack the logistics and coordination capabilities needed to undertake a large humanitarian intervention and would continue to rely on NATO capacities through Berlin Plus arrangements.[79]

Another more promising initiative is the creation of the European Gendarmerie Force (EGF), a joint effort between France, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and Portugal. The EGF will be comprised of 3,000 gendarmerie officers, who will be trained under a common ESDP doctrine and able to be deployed in 30 days to intervention and post-conflict peacekeeping missions. The first EGF commander is French and headquarters are based in Vincenza, Italy. In recognition of the unique capacities that constabulary forces bring to peace and stability environments, the EGF will be available to deploy under UN,

[78] FfP interviews EU and NATO, Brussels, February 2005. In June of 2003, the French-led EU mission to the DRC, Operation Artemis, intervened to shore up the beleaguered UN until new UN peacekeepers could be deployed. Although the goal of the EU intervention force was to bolster the UN, it was not under a UN mandate.
[79] Ibid.

OSCE or NATO mandates. Participation in the EGF is open to all EU countries, and the force should be operational in 2005-2006.[80]

Overall, current EU capacities are much more suited to military interventions aimed at short-term crisis response and police and rule of law training. The EUFOR mission in Bosnia will be the ultimate test of the organization's capabilities in managing a large-scale peacekeeping operation. It is doubtful, at least in the near future, that the EU will be able to mount a sizable intervention that could match NATO capabilities. While the new EU missions in Africa show promise, the long-term sustainability of such missions will continue to remain contingent on member-state donations.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

Starting with the intervention and subsequent peacekeeping mission in Bosnia in 1995, NATO role as a regional military organization has evolved. Currently, NATO forms the core of the peacekeeping operation in Kosovo (KFOR) and leads the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF). NATO has also expanded training, assistance and counter-terrorism exercises to the Middle East, Mediterranean, and Africa. Because it has the most sophisticated military assets and streamlined planning and command structure, NATO remains the most capable regional organization that can rapidly respond to crises.

NATO's recent expansion outside of its area of responsibility (AOR) has signaled the growing need for the alliance to adapt and expand its structure as well as play a greater political role as an organization. Tensions have emerged within the alliance about using the organization to undertake peace support operations outside of Europe and expanding its political influence. In particular, several member states have voiced outright objection to any NATO role in Africa, contending that the EU should take on more of a responsibility for crisis-response on the continent than NATO. Additionally, the rift between the U.S. and its European allies over the war in Iraq has prompted some NATO allies to declare that the organization is becoming irrelevant as a forum to coordinate transatlantic security strategies.

Despite the fact that NATO began as a Cold War military alliance dedicated to maintaining Western European security, it has transformed itself over the past decade to confront the wide range of new threats and security challenges posed by terrorism, transnational crime, humanitarian catastrophes, and natural disasters. Following the Prague Summit of 2002, NATO ministers of defense and military planning staff conducted comprehensive reviews and initiated broad reforms for the transformation of the Alliance. These reforms have included an overhaul of command and control structures, doctrine and strategy, force-generation and procurement, and internal procedures. A key component of the Prague Summit Commitment to modernize the

[80] FfP interviews, The Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units (COESPU), Vicenza Italy, February 2005.

Alliance and streamline its crisis-response capabilities was the creation of the NATO Response Force (NRF). [81]

Originally proposed by US Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, the NRF was launched at the Prague Summit and approved at a June 2003 NATO Ministers of Defense meeting. Comprised of member-state contributions of sea, land, air and special forces, the NRF is a rapid-reaction force able to be deployed globally in 5-30 days and sustainable in-theatre for a month. The NRF, which should reach full operational readiness in 2006, will contain a specially tailored land brigade, a carrier battle group with maritime surface and subsurface combat units, and an air component capable of 200 combat sorties a day. The main underlying principle of the NRF is "first force in, first force out." It will be able to be deployed in a wide range of crisis-response missions, either as a stand-alone force, an initial entry force or as a "demonstrative force package." Its main tasks are envisaged to include civilian evacuation, managing biological, nuclear or chemical disasters, crisis response and peacekeeping operations, and counterterrorism and embargo missions. In October 2004, the NRF reached initial operational capability with 17,000 troops ready. NATO plans to have the NRF fully operational, with 21,000 troops, by October 2006.[82]

While the NRF gives NATO a highly evolved and flexible rapid-response capacity potentially able to be deployed prior to a UN or regional peacekeeping operation, there is a concern about how it will be used in the short term. Political sensitivities within the Alliance were raised, for example, around discussions over the potential use of the NRF in Darfur, Sudan. France, in particular, strongly opposed a robust role for NATO in Africa and has contended that it would undermine African attempts to solve the continent's problems. Currently, NATO is supplying the AU mission in Darfur with logistical and lift assistance although the NRF could provide a desperately needed bridging capacity for the beleaguered mission.[83]

The use of the NRF in support of other regional peacekeeping missions also raises key concerns about interoperability and command and control. While interoperability with the EU is not a concern among European forces that comprise the majority of the NRF, it remains highly unlikely that NATO would allow its forces to come under the command of another regional body like the AU. Having forces deployed under different chains of command would create further difficulties in coordination. While Berlin Plus allows for NATO assets to be used by the EU, special provisions with other regional and subregional organizations on different continents do not exist.[84]

Another issue that NATO, and the EU, is struggling to address is the issue of force generation. Matching actual capabilities to political commitments has been a problem for both organizations and one that NATO, in particular, has been striving to address. Alliance member countries often lack the political will, resources, and capabilities to

[81] FfP interviews NATO Brussels, February 2005. Also see NATO NRF agreements online at: www.nato.int/issues/nrf/index.html
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] FfP interviews EU and NATO, Brussels, February 2005.

pledge troops for a sustained operation outside of Alliance territory. In the past, NATO would ask members to pledge a specific number of forces and equipment for each particular operation based on identified requirements. This led to gaps in the planning process and often resulted in one or two member states carrying, and financing, the majority of the burden for an operation. As one NATO official remarked: "We were more in a reactionary than anticipatory position when a crisis broke out." Additionally, governments often imposed caveats restricting in which operations their forces could be used and for how long, making planning more tedious.[85]

NATO attempted to address these issues comprehensively at the 2004 Istanbul Summit at which defense ministers agreed that a minimum of 40% of each Alliance nation's land forces should be structured and equipped to deploy for out-of-area operations. It was also agreed that 8% of land forces should be designated to long-term operations and be able to deploy immediately to NATO or other operations. A comprehensive set of indicators documenting specific personnel and equipment capabilities of Alliance members, as well as deployment and sustainability timeframes, is also being created. To address issues of ad-hoc force generation specifically, NATO created an annual force-generation conference, the first of which was held at SHAPE in November 2004. The goal of the annual conferences, which also brings together non-NATO members, is to give countries a longer timeframe to prepare their forces to meet NATO's projections of its annual operational needs. The long-term objective is to move the Alliance away from a reactionary crisis-response position toward the goal of improving burden sharing within the organization by anticipating needs and annually documenting actual capacities.[86]

Another considerable obstacle confronting NATO remains the financial challenges facing the organization as it expands and takes on responsibility for a wider range of missions. NATO requires its members to pay the financial costs of its deployments abroad, and as a result NATO is unable to utilize the troops and equipment of some of its smaller member countries who cannot pay the attendant costs. Finally, the use of well-equipped NATO troops in sustained operations, like Kosovo or Afghanistan, is simply more costly in the long term than the use of UN or other forces.[87]

Although NATO has been concentrating on better coordination and handover to civilian agencies once the "hard-side" of a peace enforcement of peacekeeping mission is concluded, it has been criticized for not doing a better job at the devolution of authority and adequate information sharing. Within NATO itself, particularly regarding the future use of the NRF, there are concerns that other international and regional organizations will not commit to a follow-on presence in a reasonable time period to allow the organization to plan a viable exit strategy. In Bosnia, NATO deployment in the SFOR mission was extended years beyond what was originally envisioned, and military authority could only be transferred once the military arm of the EU was developed. In Kosovo, plans to significantly draw down NATO's presence were quickly scuttled when UN forces and local police proved unable to end the March 2004 riots that tore through the province. In

[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid and please see: http://www.nato.int/issues/capabilities/index.html
[87] FfP interviews NATO Brussels, February 2005.

Afghanistan, the environment remains highly insecure four years after the intervention, and it is difficult to imagine that ISAF will be able to handover the military side of the mission in the foreseeable future.[88]

In Kosovo, and to a lessening degree in Bosnia, there remains the perception on the part of local populations that without a NATO presence there will be no genuine security against a return to violence. While the EU has done a considerable job at advertising its willingness to use force if necessary, NATO over-the-horizon (OTH) forces are still on alert to intervene should violence resume. The threat of a return to violence in the Balkans is most acute in Kosovo where the province's unresolved status, high rate of criminality, and growing radicalism make it a flashpoint. An investigation by the UN into the lack of international and local coordination in quelling the 2004 riots found that NATO, while itself able to deal with the chaos, had little faith in other organizations.[89] An absence of pre-planning on how to coordinate NATO, UN, OSCE, and local police capacities to deal with a possible riot also allowed the violence to spread and escalate sharply before NATO was finally able to get the situation under control.[90] As of December 2005, NATO has more than 17,000 peacekeepers from more than 35 NATO member and non-member countries under its command in Kosovo.[91]

In Afghanistan, it was clear from the beginning that the country would not only have to be completely rebuilt, but also rejoined, province-by-province. One of the more innovative strategies towards accomplishing the goal of expanding the authority and legitimacy of the nascent central government outside of the capital has been the deployment of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs). It also represents a pioneering attempt to coordinate the civilian and military components of a stability and reconstruction operation. The PRTs in Afghanistan contain both a small civilian reconstruction and a military security presence numbering between 100-300 personnel. They are an attempt to co-locate and coordinate the often-disparate efforts of the "hard" and "soft" elements needed to secure and rebuild a state. PRTs are also intended to leave a "light footprint" rather than employ an overwhelming use of force to secure the country.

Introduced in 2003, there are now over 20 PRTs located throughout Afghanistan with plans to expand and hand over more responsibility from Coalition forces to the NATO ISAF. While the initial Coalition PRTs were led by the U.S., UK, Germany and New Zealand, other nations have stepped forward to assume leadership roles for new and expanded ISAF PRTs. Canada, Spain, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Norway are also currently leading PRTs in Afghanistan.

[88] FfP interviews, NATO Camp Butmir, Sarajevo, January 2005 and KFOR headquarters, Pristina, February 2005.
[89] Following the March 2004 riots, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan appointed a private international investigation into the cause and response to the riots. The full findings have not yet been released by the UN to the public.
[90] FfP interviews, Command KFOR and UNMIK headquarters, Pristina, February 2005.
[91] NATO Kosovo Force Website: www.nato.int/kosovo/kosovo.htm

Initial assessments have concluded that the PRT model, utilizing an incremental approach to spread the authority of the central government outside of Kabul, has seen some key successes. In many of the provinces where the PRTs have been deployed, there have been critical improvements to local infrastructure, a reduction in the cultivation of opium, and the demobilization and disarmament of militias. PRTs have also achieved success in "winning the hearts and minds" of tribal leaders and local populations in several important provinces. A combination of high visibility and cultural sensitivity has allowed many national PRT commanders and staff to gain the trust of populations on the ground. This, in turn, has fostered greater local buy-in on both the security and development sides of the mission.[92]

Following the March 2004 Kosovo riots and as evidenced by the formation of PRTs in Afghanistan, NATO is making a stronger effort to work more closely with other organizations on intelligence sharing and coordination efforts. However, with the continued instability in Kosovo and ongoing violence in Afghanistan, NATO will need to remain engaged in both operations in the future. While the EU may eventually be able to assume more global responsibilities in undertaking robust interventions and maintaining post-conflict security, NATO has more direct experience and better planning capacities in the short term. Despite political infighting within both organizations, it is likely that until the EU is able to deploy its battle groups fully, NATO will remain Europe's primary tool for undertaking a sizable, robust intervention. Also, as so much has been invested in the EU's ability to implement civil capacities in a post-conflict environment, it is unlikely that NATO's role in that sphere will be enhanced significantly in the future.

National Capacities in Selected Countries

Western European countries have been long-standing contributors to UN peacekeeping operations. However, the major European countries are now mainly deploying their troops to NATO and EU operations. Nonetheless, France, the UK, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the Nordic countries play lead roles in training and doctrine development and are crucial in supporting UN peacekeeping.

Central and Eastern European countries are now increasing their contributions to missions around the world. In former communist countries faced with the significant downsizing of their armed forces and the need to replace outdated equipment, peacekeeping operations have provided revenue to the armed forces as well as training opportunities.

[92] Please see USIP Special Report #117, "Establishing the Rule of Law in Afghanistan." Available online at: http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr117.html ; Sean M. Maloney, "Afghanistan Four Years On: An Assessment" *Parameters,* Autumn 2005. Available online at: http://carlislewww.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05autumn/maloney.pdf ; CSIS report, "In the Balance: Measuring Progress in Afghanistan," July 2005. Available online at: http://www.csis.org/isp/pcr/inthebalance.pdf ; Seth G. Jones, et al. "Establishing Law and Order After Conflict," The RAND Corporation, 2005. Available online at: http://www.csis.org/isp/pcr/inthebalance.pdf

In Eastern Europe, Poland and Ukraine contributed the most forces to UN peacekeeping operations, averaging about 700 each in 2005. Over the past several years, Balkan countries, such as Romania and Serbia-Montenegro, have increased their contributions to UN peacekeeping missions as well. As in Latin America, the need to restructure national militaries has led to a spike in Eastern European participation in peacekeeping operations. Eastern European countries have also brought important capacities to peacekeeping missions, both in terms of training and equipment. Polish and Ukrainian troops, in particular, have been highly praised for their professionalism and flexibility in Kosovo. During the March 2004 riots, as well as in other outbreaks of fighting in the province, Polish and Ukrainian soldiers and police played critical roles in quelling the violence and restoring security. They have also been lauded for their abilities to respond rapidly in crisis situations and coordinate well with other troop-contributing countries.[93]

For Serbia-Montenegro, the hope of joining the NATO Partnership for Peace (PfP) holds the most promise for military reform and integration with Western European nations. In the meantime, the government has embarked on an aggressive defense reform strategy that includes downsizing the armed forces, although budgetary constraints have greatly hindered the process. Some officials in the Ministry of Defense and Foreign Affairs believe that increasing Serbian contributions to peacekeeping and stability operations, including non-UN missions, would greatly help in both military reform and also improving the Serbian image abroad. As one former foreign minister stated, "Serbia has some of the best-trained and well-equipped troops in all of the former Yugoslavia. We could be very valuable in peacekeeping missions."[94]

While the issues of war criminals and the unresolved status of Kosovo continue to undermine Serbian political credibility abroad, the professionalization and reform of the armed services through Western partnerships is viewed favorably by many in the Serbian military. According to officials at the OSCE in Serbia who are working with the Ministry of Defense on reform, Serbia could contribute strong police and border-monitoring capacities to peacekeeping missions. Serbian military equipment, the typical heavy armor of most former communist countries, could be updated to provide a valuable capacity in high-intensity operations, such as Afghanistan and Iraq.[95] In July 2003, it was reported that in a visit to Washington, then Serbian Prime Minister Zoran Zivkovic offered to send approximately 1,000 Serbian troops and police to Afghanistan.[96] Although the offer was eventually turned down by NATO and the U.S. due to political sensitivities, Serbia is likely to seek to increase its participation in such missions in the future.

Hungary and Romania have also sought to increase the participation of their armed forces in UN, NATO, and coalition-led peace and stability operations. Facing a 20% cut in its defense budget and a reduction of its armed forces, Hungary has made the missions in the Balkans its peacekeeping priority. Hungary has contributed approximately 1,000 troops, police, and military observers to the EU mission in Bosnia, the NATO operation in

[93] FfP interviews, Washington, DC, Romania, Brussels, Kosovo, February/March 2005.
[94] FfP interviews in Belgrade; January 2005.
[95] FfP interviews in Belgrade; January 2005.
[96] Please see report: www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/news/2003/10/mil-031008-rferl-160259.htm

Afghanistan, and various other UN missions. As of late 2004, peacekeeping training has become part of basic training for the army with military-observer courses also being offered. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the overall coordinating ministry for Hungarian participation in peacekeeping operations, plans to sustain Hungarian commitments at these levels.[97]

Hungarian land forces trained for peacekeeping consist of three light infantry brigades, and the government currently rents one Antonov transport plane from Ukraine. Hungary also has several valuable niche capacities that it plans to expand to make available for future NATO or EU missions, including a rapidly deployable engineering battalion that received praise for its work in the Balkans. It also has made available on short notice biological and water purification labs to the NRF, one of which was deployed to assist the ISAF operation in Afghanistan. It also has a unit that can be made ready in 30 days consisting of medical teams and chemical and biological weapons experts. Hungary contributes around 100 troops to the Integrated Police Unit (IPU) in Sarajevo where it provides hardtop military transport vehicles and force protection to the Italian-led stability police unit.[98]

Romania has also increased its participation in peacekeeping and stability operations, contributing to ISAF in Afghanistan, EUFOR in Bosnia, the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq, and ten UN missions. Romania is currently downsizing its land forces while simultaneously updating its military equipment to meet NATO standards. While it possesses a large fleet of tanks and APCs, the cost of upgrading equipment has put a significant strain on the Ministry of Defense budget. Romania plans to modernize its fleet of 54 tanks available for peace and stability operations. The Romanian Ministry of Defense has also purchased two new frigates from the UK, purportedly to ensure naval interoperability with NATO and for improved patrolling capacities in the Black Sea. This move has been criticized by some leading Romanian journalists who cover defense sector reform as being hasty and ill sighted. One prominent journalist remarked that Romania does not have the budget to maintain the frigates and should have spent the money on purchasing lift capacity. Romania does not possess heavy lift capacity and had to rely on the UN, NATO, and rentals from Ukraine to transport its troops into theater.[99]

Romania's top priority is coordinating command-and-control structures to meet NATO requirements. To this end, Romania has opened three national education centers dedicated to training defense professionals in common NATO and U.S. planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation systems. Harmonizing Romanian defense sector reform process with NATO integration has also proved useful in synchronizing measures to fight organized crime on the Black Sea, another top government priority. Romania hopes to coordinate bilateral efforts better to combat transnational crime on the Black Sea with fellow NATO member, Turkey, as well as continue to conduct multilateral exercises with Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Bulgaria.[100]

[97] FfP interviews, Hungarian Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, January 2005.
[98] FfP interviews, Hungarian Ministry of Defense, January 2005.
[99] FfP interviews, Romanian Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defense, January and February 2005.
[100] Ibid.

Romania is also the only country in Southeastern Europe that, like Italy, France, and Spain, possesses a national gendarmerie force. The first deployment of the Romanian Gendarmerie was to Kosovo in 1999 where it now serves under UNMIK and is known as the Romanian Special Police Unit. The Romanian SPU consists of 115 gendarmes of which 12 are officers and the rest are NCOs. The SPUs, under UNMIK police command, are the first forces to be deployed to deal with riots or other violent demonstrations that require a more robust policing capacity than CIVPOL or the KPS can provide. In Peja, the Romanian SPU took the lead in creating a stability police unit within the KPS to, as one officer described, "Leave behind an intermediate force capacity within the indigenous police structure." As the March 2004 riots demonstrated, the potential for violence to escalate beyond the capabilities of civilian police remains a distinct possibility in the province. The creation of an indigenous stability police force is therefore crucial in ensuring that the province will be able to provide for its own security when the UN and NATO eventually leave.[101]

The Romanian SPU, like the Italian and French units, has extensive training in riot control, search and rescue, investigation, drugs and weapons interdiction, VIP escort, and dangerous arrests. In April 2002, the Romanian SPU provided critical backup support in putting down a demonstration in the divided northern city of Mitrovica when it turned violent as the crowd began to throw hand grenades at a Polish SPU. It has also successfully performed, alone and in conjunction with other SPUs, arrests of dangerous war criminals wanted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and successful interceptions of major drugs and weapons caches. The Romanian SPU is also highly familiar and adept at operating in the rugged mountainous terrain in the Balkans, crucial in stopping illegal cross-border trafficking. The Romanian Gendarmerie is currently under the civilian command of UNMIK but, like the Italian Carabinieri, can also be placed under military chain of command in a peacekeeping operation.[102] This flexibility is important in the deployment of stability police to peacekeeping operations as it removes a critical caveat that often hampers how gendarmerie forces can be employed abroad.[103]

Finally, an initiative in Southeastern Europe that is attempting to take a regional approach to provide the UN, NATO and the EU with a capacity for a rapidly deployable peacekeeping brigade is the South-East Europe Brigade, or SEEBRIG. SEEBRIG is headquartered in Constanta, Romania with participation from Albania, Bulgaria Macedonia, Romania, Turkey, Greece, and Italy. Activated in September 1999, it is a brigade-sized force of about 5,000 troops, which contains a mechanized infantry

[101] FfP interviews, National Gendarmerie Training School, Bucharest; Romanian Special Police Unit, Kosovo, January and February 2005.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Most national gendarmerie forces fall are under the leadership of the Ministry of Interior when they are at home and some, when deployed abroad, come under the auspices of the Ministry of Defense. In certain instances, national governments have refused to allow their gendarmerie forces to come under a foreign military chain of command when deployed abroad, fearing they'll be used in place of the military. Unfortunately, this often defeats the purpose of deploying gendarmes at all, as their abilities to act in an intermediate force environment is critical in post-conflict settings.

regiment, four infantry mechanized battalions, and an Engineer Task Force (ETF). The ETF was formed in order to provide emergency relief and humanitarian intervention capabilities in the form of small cooperation projects like road construction and repair, bridge and rail repair, earth moving and drainage, and limited de-mining and unexploded ordnance clearance. SEEBRIG follows NATO standards and procedures, and in 2004, the evaluation process for certification by NATO was completed. It was certified as "ready with limitations", having failed to pass the assessments regarding communications and information systems.[104]

At the December 2005 Southeastern European Defense Ministerial, Ukraine was admitted to SEEBRIG which, given Ukrainian strategic lift assets, may greatly enhance the capacities of the organization. Additionally, SEEBRIG agreed to deploy its forces to Afghanistan in support of ISAF as part of the Kabul Multinational Brigade for a six-month tour. This marks the first time it has deployed out of area in support of a NATO mission and will be a critical first test of organizational capacities in areas like interoperability.[105] Future expansion of SEEBRIG will likely include Moldova, Bosnia, and Serbia, although significant military reform and transformation will need to take place at the national level before any of these countries will be admitted.

[104] FfP interviews in Romania; February 2005.

[105] "European Security Group Approves Afghan Deployment" by Gerry Gilmore, American Forces Press Services, December 6, 2005. www.defenselink.mil/news/Dec2005/20051206_3557.html

Boots on the Ground:
Protecting Civilians in Humanitarian Emergencies

Regional Organization	Political			Military		
	Authority	Legitimacy	Willingness	Financial	Planning	Doctrine Development
AU	●	●	☾	○	○	○
ECOWAS	●	●	●	☾	☾	☾
IGAD	☾	☾	○	○	○	○
SADC	○	○	○	☾	○	○
OAS	○	○	○	○	○	○
ASEAN	○	○	○	○	○	○
EU	●	●	☾	●	●	●
NATO	●	●	●	●	●	●
OSCE*	☾	☾	○	☾	☾	☾

*** The OSCE is currently involved in border monitoring missions but has expressed an interest in expanding its role. Its ability to do so, however, remains limited by Russian political sensitivities.**

Key to Symbols: ● = strong, ☾ = moderate, ○ = weak or newly developing, blank indicates that the capacity is either not applicable or was not assessed.

Survey of Niche Capacities of Selected Troop-Contributing Countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Europe

Key to Symbols:

● = strong

☾ = moderate

○ = weak or newly developing

blank = indicates that the capacity is either not applicable or was not assessed.

Region	Country	Medical	Air Lift	Troops[1]	Ground Transportation	Search & Rescue	Nuclear, Bio,Chem (NBC) Units	Crowd and Riot Control (CRC)	Engineering	Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD)/Demining	Gendarmerie
Africa	Ethiopia			●	☾			☾			
	Ghana			●	○			☾			
	Kenya	☾		●	☾			●			
	Nigeria			●	☾			☾			
	Senegal			☾	○			☾	☾	☾	●
	South Africa	☾		☾	●			☾		●	
Latin America	Argentina	☾	○	☾	☾	☾		●	☾	●	●
	Brazil	☾		☾	☾	☾		☾			
	Chile	☾	☾	☾	●	☾		●		●	●
	Uruguay			●	●	☾		☾	☾		
Asia	China[2]	☾	☾	☾	☾			☾	☾		
	Indonesia			○	○					○	
	Japan[3]	●	☾	○	●	●	●	●	●		
	Malaysia	☾		☾	●	○		☾	☾		
	Philippines	☾		☾	○	○		☾	☾		
	Singapore[4]	☾	☾	○	☾	●		●	●		
	Thailand	☾		☾	☾	●		☾	☾		
Europe	Georgia	☾		☾	☾		●			●	
	Hungary	●		☾	☾		●		●		
	Italy	●		●	●	●		●			●
	Poland			☾	●	●		●			
	Romania	●		☾	☾			●	●		●
	Serbia[5]			○	☾			☾		●	
	Ukraine[6]		●	☾	●	☾	●	●		●	

1. Troop Category reflects a demonstrated willingness and capacity to deploy troops to peacekeeping missions.
   Rating is based on the following scale, either currently deployed or having been deployed in the past five years: Weak: <500, Moderate: 500-1500, Strong: >1500
2. China is an emerging contributor to peacekeeping operations and assessments are preliminary.
3. Japan is currently engaged in internal discussions on amending its constitution to allow for an expansion of the role of the Japanese Self Defense Forces in peacekeeping operations.
4. Singapore has proven peacekeeping capacities but has indicated a hesitancy to deploy large numbers of personnel to peacekeeping operations.
5. Serbia is a recent contributor to peacekeeping operations. Following national military reform, it could potentially provide more troops and equipment to future missions.
6. Ukraine has critical strategic airlift assets, necessary for the movement of large numbers of troops and equipment.

List of Acronyms

ACOTA	African Contingency Operations Training Assistance
AMIB	African Union Mission in Burundi
AMIS	AU Mission in Sudan (original)
AMIS II	New AU Mission in Sudan
AOR	Area of responsibility
APCs	Armored personnel carriers
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASF	African Standby Force
AU	African Union (formerly Organization of African Unity)
BMAT	British Military Advisor Teams
CAECOPAZ	Centro Argentino de Entrenamiento Conjunto para Operaciones de Paz (Center for Joint Training for Peace Operations)
CBMs	Confidence building measures
CECOPAZ	Centro de Entrenamiento Conjunto de Operaciones de Paz (Instruction Center for Peacekeeping Operations)
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CIVPOL	International Civilian Police
COESPU	Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units
CPA	Comprehensive peace agreements
CRC	Crowd and riot control
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EGF	European Gendarmerie Force
ESDP	European Security and Defense Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
ETF	Engineering Task Force
EUFOR	European Union Force
EUPM	European Union Police Mission
EUSEC R.D. Congo	EU Advisory and Assistance Mission for Security Reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo
EUSR	European Union Special Representative
GWOT	Global War on Terrorism
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
IDPs	Internally displaced persons
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IPTF	International Police Task Force
IPU	Integrated Police Unit (formerly Multination Specialized Unit)
IPU	Integrated Police Unit
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force (in Afghanistan)
JAM	AU Joint Assessment Mission
JMA	Joint military affairs
KAIPTC	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre

KFOR	Kosovo Force (NATO-led)
KPS	Kosovo Police Service
KPSS	Kosovo Police Service School
KPTC	Kenya Peacekeeping Training Centre
MERCOSUR	El Mercado Común del Sur (Southern Common Market)
MINUSTAH	UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti
MNTF-N	Multinational Task Force North
MOD	Ministry of Defense
MONUC	UN Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCOs	Non-commissioned officers
NEO	Non-combatant evacuation operation
NRF	NATO Response Force
OAS	Organization of American States
OAU	Organization of African Unity (now known as African Union)
ONUB	UN Mission in Burundi
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
OTH	Over-the-horizon
PACOM	U.S. Pacific Command
PfP	Partnership for Peace (NATO)
PIFWICS	Persons indicted for war crimes
PKOs	Peacekeeping operations
PSC	Peace and Security Council (of the AU)
RECAMP	Renforcement des capacités africaines de maintien de la paix (Reinforcement of African Peacekeeping Capacities)
ROEs	Rules of engagement
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SEEBRIG	South-Eastern Europe Brigade
SFOR	Stabilization Force in Bosnia (NATO-led)
SHAPE	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe
SIPA	State Investigation and Protection Agency
SOPs	Standard operating procedures
SPLM	Sudan People's Liberation Movement
SPU	Special Police Unit
TCC	Troop contributing countries
UN	United Nations
UNMEE	UN Mission in Ethiopia-Eritrea
UNMIK	UN Mission in Kosovo
UNMIL	UN Mission in Liberia
UNTAC	UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia

THE FUND FOR PEACE
1701 K Street, NW
Eleventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 223-7940 (phone)
(202) 223-7947 (fax)
www.fundforpeace.org